

3645. Also, petition of the Southern Transportation Co., Philadelphia, Pa., opposing Senate bill 2009 and urging support of certain amendments to exclude water carriers of bulk cargoes by barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3646. Also, petition of the Furriers Joint Council of New York, urging the passage of the Casey bill (H. R. 6470); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3647. Also, petition of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C., favoring the Casey bill (H. R. 6470); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3648. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Local No. 52, New York City, favoring the Ramspeck bill (H. R. 960); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3649. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the Northern West Virginia Coal Association, Fairmont, W. Va., urging that final action on Senate bill 2420 be postponed until the next Congress convenes, in order to give its membership an opportunity to study it and ascertain whether it will be advantageous or disadvantageous to the coal industry in northern West Virginia and elsewhere; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

3650. By Mr. THOMAS of Texas: Letter from R. M. Farrar, president, the Union National Bank, Houston, Tex., dealing with the general subject of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3651. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Frank Pfleger and 59 others, requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the House bill 5620, the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3652. Also, petition of Laura M. Smith, requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3653. Also, petition of F. S. Evans and 59 others, requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3654. Also, petition of Nina Y. Sprecher and eight others, requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3655. Also, petition of Lena R. Mills and 29 others, requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3656. Also, petition of Audra Limbert and 61 others, requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3657. Also, petition of C. W. Ackerson and 59 others, requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3658. Also, petition of Ed. T. Young and 29 others, requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3659. Also, petition of P. J. Cole, Sr., and 29 others, requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact House bill 5620, the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3660. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Council of the City of Cleveland, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591 and House bill 2888; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3661. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, United States Veterans' Hospital Local 159, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 960; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3662. Also, petition of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House Joint Resolution 266, Works Progress Administration appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3663. Also, petition of the Propeller Club of the United States, port of Pittsburg, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 2009; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3664. Also, petition of code members of Alabama, southern Tennessee, and Georgia, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the bituminous-coal industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1939

Rev. Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, most holy, most mighty, and immortal God, who dwellest between the cherubim and seraphim, in majesty and awe: Behold in mercy all Thy servants on whom Thou hast laid the governance of this Nation, and especially for its Senate in Congress assembled; that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors upon the best and surest foundations, and that they, remembering whose stewards they are, may, both by their lives and works, show forth Thy praise, to Thine eternal glory and the welfare of Thy people; through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, to whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost be all honor and glory, world without end. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 9, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman
Andrews	Donahey	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Downey	King	Reed
Bailey	Ellender	La Follette	Russell
Bankhead	Frazier	Lee	Schwartz
Barbour	George	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Gerry	Logan	Sheppard
Bilbo	Gibson	Lucas	Smith
Bone	Gillette	Lundeen	Stewart
Borah	Glass	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Guffey	McNary	Truman
Burke	Gurney	Maloney	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hale	Mead	Van Nuys
Capper	Harrison	Minton	Wagner
Caraway	Hatch	Neely	Walsh
Chavez	Hayden	Norris	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Herring	Nye	White
Clark, Mo.	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Connally	Holt	Overton	
Danaher	Hughes	Pepper	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is necessarily absent on public business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of an operation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 8th instant,

On June 9, 1939, after adjournment of the Senate, the following message was received by the Secretary from the House of Representatives: That the Speaker had affixed the signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1031. An act to amend section 243 of the Penal Code of the United States, as amended by the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 378), relating to the marking of packages containing wild animals and birds and parts thereof; and

S. 1243. An act to authorize the use of War Department equipment for the Confederate Veterans' 1939 Reunion at Trinidad, Colo., August 22, 23, 24, and 25, 1939.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations and withdrawing a nomination were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hess, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calhoun, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1886) to extend to June 16, 1942, the period within which certain loans to executive officers of member banks of the Federal Reserve System may be renewed or extended, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4218) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 18 to the bill and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6260) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. KERR, Mr. POWERS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. BOLTON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6635) to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR COPELAND, OF NEW YORK

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I prepared an address which I expected to deliver when the memorial addresses were made in the Senate a few days ago on the life, character, and public service of the late Senator from New York, Hon. Royal S. Copeland, but on account of lack of time on that occasion did not do so. I therefore now ask unanimous con-

sent to have inserted in the RECORD the remarks prepared by me as a fitting tribute to the memory of the late Senator from New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the law profession possibly has contributed more men to Government service than any other of the professions. It has fallen to the happy lot of Senator ROYAL SAMUEL COPELAND, more affectionately known as Dr. COPELAND, to furnish incontrovertible proof that the knowledge of jurisprudence is no more essential for high achievement in the affairs of government than a corresponding knowledge of the science of medicine.

Dr. ROYAL COPELAND was the incarnation of a great physician. It was with the eyes of a man skilled in the treatment of the frailties of the human body that he looked upon the physical and economic ills of society. His analysis of the provisions of any proposed measure for congressional consideration was not from the viewpoint of a practiced and experienced attorney, but from the higher vantage ground of a sympathetic and inquiring physician. He diagnosed rather than analyzed by first seeking the cause of the ailment or maladjustment to be treated and then applied the remedy, which he already knew. His powerful intellect represented an apothecary shop, shelved with all the scientific curative preparations essential for the control and alleviation of political and social agony. Being a physician to the manner born, he was possessed of a versatility of interests. True to his high calling, devotion to all things of human concern was exemplified in the wide range of his tireless activities—activities that embraced a scope confined to no less limits than the full compass of all of man's privations and sorrows.

No finer or more appropriate trinity of words for the delineation of character can be applied to this great and good man than to speak of him and to think of him as patriot, physician, and philanthropist. Patriot, in the sense that he loved democracy and democratic institutions; physician, in the sense that he pondered profoundly upon the way of man that led not unto death but to an abundant life and a sustained happiness; philanthropist, in the sense that he gave freely of his time, of his talent, and of his great storehouse of scientific knowledge to the service and betterment of humanity.

Senator COPELAND enacted the role also of a great pacificator. It was almost invariably thrust upon him the peculiar prerogative to adjust difficult and sensitive differences, to heal angry wounds, and apply a soothing ointment to old sores. With an amazing facility he brought about the meeting of many minds with respect to important legislation. The major operation was always trusted to his trained hands by virtue not only of his skill in performing the operation but of his willingness to do the job, and the major responsibilities were always shifted to his strong shoulders because there was no other so eminently capable of carrying the weight of the burden to be borne.

To my mind, Senator COPELAND was a man—

Who never turned his back but marched breast forward,  
Never doubted clouds would break;  
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,  
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,  
Sleep, to wake.

Many years ago Mr. Joe Mitchell Chapple, while engaged in collecting Favorite Heart Throbs of Famous People, for publication in a volume of that title, called upon Dr. COPELAND to ascertain his favorite heartthrob in relation to poems. The great physician immediately recited these lines:

What are the names of the Fortunate Isles?  
Duty and Love and a Broad Content,  
These are the Isles of the Watery Miles.  
That God let down from the Firmament.  
Duty and Love and a baby's smile,  
Ah, these, O friends, are the Fortunate Isles.

After repeating this poem as his favorite heartthrob, he said:

I memorized those words and carried the newspaper clipping in my pocket until it was worn out, but failed to learn the name of the author. If you can tell me, I will appreciate it very much.



Upon being informed that Joaquin Miller was the author, he expressed his appreciation of the information, and after again quoting the six lines of his favorite poem, he said:

It reflects the sentiment of a lover of children and discloses a new "somewhere" in the widening vision of humans—the broad planes and spheres of duty, the heights and depths of love, all of which is enhaled in the great objective of one of life's sweetest dreams—a baby's smile.

In this favorite heartthrob of the great physician there is afforded appropriate conclusion to this brief and affectionate tribute to his memory.

#### CREATION OF TRUSTS BY INDIVIDUAL INDIANS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the creation of trusts by individual Indians with the United States as trustee, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### LANDS FOR SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE, ARIZONA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the purchase of certain lands for the San Carlos Apache Tribe, Arizona, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### VARIABLE PAYMENT OF CONSTRUCTION CHARGES ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a feasible and comprehensive plan for the variable payment of construction charges on United States reclamation projects, to protect the investment of the United States in such projects, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

#### APRIL REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submitting, pursuant to law, the report of the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for the month of April 1939, including a statement of loan and other authorizations made during the month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case, and so forth, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Legislature of Nebraska, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

##### Legislative Resolution 39

Resolution memorializing the Honorable F. F. Hill, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, to defer payments of principal and interest on defaulted Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans as to deserving farmers of the State of Nebraska.

Whereas the State of Nebraska has been visited by 5 successive years of devastating droughts; and

Whereas the crops of the State of Nebraska have been ravaged for a number of years by grasshoppers; and

Whereas it is now evident that irreparable damage has already been done this year to the small-grain crop, by insufficient moisture and grasshoppers; and

Whereas the small-grain crop is the first cash crop for the farmers of the State of Nebraska; and

Whereas due to these ravages of Nature, the purchasing power of the farmers of the State of Nebraska is the lowest of any other State in the United States, as shown by recent reports of the Department of Agriculture of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska in fifty-third regular session assembled:*

(1) That the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature respectfully calls these matters to the attention of the Honorable F. F. Hill, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, and respectfully requests that payments of principal and interest on defaulted Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans be deferred as to deserving farmers of the State of Nebraska until another crop can be harvested and marketed.

(2) That this resolution be spread at large upon the journal of this legislature, and that the clerk of this legislature is hereby ordered and directed forthwith to forward a copy of this resolution.

LXXXIV—441

tion, properly authenticated and suitably engrossed, to the Honorable F. F. Hill, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Nebraska in the Congress to the end that representatives in the Government and in the Congress of the United States will be advised that this legislature considers as imperative the deferment of defaulted Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans to deserving farmers of the State of Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution of Farmers Union Local No. 267, Hogeland, Mont., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2395, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Rev. W. R. Thomas, pastor of Zephaniah Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the laying off of and alleged discrimination against certain employees of the Works Progress Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of Local No. 402, Boca Tunnel and Construction Workers Union, of Truckee, Calif., protesting against amendment of the National Labor Relations Act, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate the memorial of the American Baptist Association, representing 2,000 Baptist churches in about 15 States, remonstrating against amendment of the Social Security Act so as to affect religious bodies, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of a committee of retired railway employees of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to each retired railway employee over 65 years of age who is entitled to retirement benefit and pension not less than \$50 per month, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate telegrams in the nature of memorials from the grand regent, Court Columbia, Catholic Daughters of America, and the grand State regent, Catholic Daughters of America, both of New York, N. Y., remonstrating against the confirmation of the nomination of Archibald MacLeish, of Connecticut, to be Librarian of Congress, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the Central Labor Union of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the enactment of pending legislation providing an additional \$800,000,000 for Federal housing projects, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. VANDENBERG presented memorials, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the exclusion of white-collar workers, including the Federal music project, from the terms of the bill (S. 1265) to establish a Department of Public Works, to amend certain sections of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. REED presented telegrams and papers in the nature of memorials from the librarian of the Winfield Public Library, the librarian of the Carnegie Free Public Library of Manhattan, the librarian of the Hutchinson Public Library, the president of the board of trustees, and the president of the Library Trustees' Association of Kansas, the president of the Kansas Library Association, officers of the Kellogg Library and the Kansas State Teachers College, of Emporia, all in the State of Kansas, and the assistant cataloger of the University of Maryland, College Park, Md., remonstrating against the confirmation of the nomination of Archibald MacLeish, of Connecticut, to be Librarian of Congress, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. HOLT presented the memorial of Local No. 1643, United Mine Workers of America, of Monangah, W. Va., remonstrating against amendment of the National Labor Relations Act at the present time, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution of the Northern West Virginia Coal Association, favoring postponement of Senate bill

2420 until the next session of Congress so as to ascertain whether it will be advantageous or disadvantageous to the coal industry in northern West Virginia, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also presented a paper in the nature of a memorial from 50 citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., remonstrating against a third term of office for any President, regardless of party affiliation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented a resolution of the City Council of Marlboro, Mass., favoring additional appropriations for the Works Progress Administration and the preservation of "white collar" projects, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented the petition of the mayor and 19 members of the City Council of Boston, and sundry citizens, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying adequate appropriations for the Works Progress Administration to continue unimpaired the laboring, "white collar," and Federal arts projects without further increase in costs to local governments, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALSH also presented the following resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration:

Resolutions memorializing Congress in favor of the granting of full United States citizenship to aliens who served in the Military or Naval Establishments of the United States during the World War and were honorably discharged from such service

*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to give proper recognition to aliens who served this country during the World War by the enactment of an *en masse* legislation and the taking of such other action as may be necessary to declare that every alien who served in the Military or Naval Establishment of the United States during the World War and who has received an honorable discharge from such service is a citizen of the United States by virtue of such service; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LODGE also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented the following resolution of the House of Representatives of Texas, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

#### House Resolution 303

Whereas the surplus stocks of cotton in this country now total about 14,000,000 bales, of which 11,400,000 bales are stored under Government loan to producers; and

Whereas for over a century growers have been wrapping cotton in an imported material which is known as jute bagging; and

Whereas the commissioner of agriculture of Texas estimates that approximately 2 percent of the bagging used for wrapping cotton in Texas is cotton bagging and approximately 98 percent is jute; and

Whereas jute is used for the purpose of wrappers, bags, burlap, and twine; and

Whereas millions of square yards of cotton cloth, which were once used for making all commodities, have retreated before the paper bags; and

Whereas in 1925 only 10 percent of the national cement supply was shipped in paper bags, and in 1936 this figure had risen to 42 percent; and

Whereas cotton bagging is cheaper in the long run because it can be used 10 or 12 times, while paper is only used once; and

Whereas jute, paper, and rayon are three relentless enemies of the cotton industry, each armed with the deadliest weapon—lower cost; and

Whereas the cotton mountain would melt like a snow pile if an ambitious program to reinforce roads and airport runways with a layer of cotton fabric is carried through on a national basis; and

Whereas there are now well over 500 miles of cotton roads in 22 States—a mile of roadway uses 8 to 10 bales of cotton; and

Whereas the United States produces about 45 percent of the world cotton crop, and Texas is the greatest producer of cotton in the United States and the world, and American cotton exports have decreased; and

Whereas in 1936 the world's production of cotton was 28,250,000 bales, in 1938 the United States' production was 18,946,000 bales, and in 1938 Texas' production was 3,125,000 bales; and

Whereas we must do something about this surplus or risk economic disaster for the entire Nation and particularly the people of the South, who depend almost entirely on cotton for their livelihood; and

Whereas a dollar spent in research will pay rich dividends: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of Texas urge that the honorable body of the United States Congress be requested to make a thorough investigation of the uses of cotton; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Federal Government be requested to establish in Texas a cotton gin and fiber laboratory for the purpose of improving cotton technique and devising means of improving cotton fiber; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Congress be requested to make necessary appropriations to pay the difference between jute and cotton bagging so as to enable the farmers in cotton-producing States to purchase cotton bagging at the gin, which will take over 100,000 bales of cotton off of the market; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of Congress from Texas.

#### LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

Mr. MINTON (for Mr. REYNOLDS) presented a telegram from Mrs. Nell G. Battle, president of the North Carolina Library Association, Rocky Mount, N. C., which was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCKY MOUNT, N. C., June 10, 1939.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

The North Carolina Library Association earnestly protests against the appointment of any but a professionally trained librarian as Librarian of Congress. The most important library in the world needs a trained and experienced library administrator.

NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.

(Signed) MRS. NELL G. BATTLE, President.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 2150) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to supplement laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," particularly with reference to interlocking bank directorates, known as the Clayton Act, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 586) thereon.

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1021) to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army who are physically injured in line of duty while performing active duty or engaged in authorized training, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 587) thereon.

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted a report (No. 588) to accompany the bill (S. 1850) to aid the States and Territories in making provisions for the retirement of employees of the land-grant colleges, heretofore reported by him from that committee with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was recommitted the bill (S. 1155) to provide for probationary appointments of officers in the Regular Army, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 589) thereon.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erikson Day, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 590) thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 9, 1939, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 189) to provide for the confiscation of firearms in possession of persons convicted of felony and disposition thereof.



## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

S. 2587. A bill for the relief of Juanita L. Caza; and

S. 2588. A bill for the relief of Ellis L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MINTON:

S. 2589. A bill to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Harrison County, Ind.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 2590. A bill to provide for the transfer to the government of the District of Columbia of a certain tract of land belonging to the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2591. A bill to provide a feasible and comprehensive plan for the variable payment of construction charges on United States reclamation projects, to protect the investment of the United States in such projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 2592. A bill to provide for assistance by the Federal Government in the control and eradication of noxious weeds; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2593. A bill to amend section 186 of the Criminal Code, as amended; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 2594. A bill relating to pensions for dependents of the officers and enlisted men who lost their lives in the submarine *Squalus*; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2595. A bill for the relief of Lloyd S. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6635) to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6635) to amend the Social Security Act; and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

## EXPENSES OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS AND RECEPTION OF THE KING AND QUEEN OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and Mr. BYRNES, subsequently, from the same committee, reported the resolution without amendment, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the expenses incurred by the joint committee appointed pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 17, Seventy-sixth Congress, to arrange for the reception of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Great Britain in the Rotunda of the Capitol on June 9, 1939, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

## RED CEDAR SHINGLES IMPORTED FROM CANADA

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH submitted a resolution (S. Res. 144), which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

*Resolved.* That the Secretary of State is requested to enter into negotiations with the Government of Canada with a view to arranging for modification of the trade agreement entered into with Canada on November 17, 1938, in such manner as to provide for reserving to the United States the right to limit the quantity of red cedar shingles which may be imported into the United States, to the same extent that the quantity of such shingles permitted to be imported was limited under section 811 of the Revenue Act of 1936 prior to the making of such trade agreement.

CAPE FEAR RIVER, N. C., AT AND BELOW WILMINGTON (S. DOC. 83)

On motion by Mr. BAILEY, a letter from the Secretary of War to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, transmitting, in response to a reso-

lution of the committee, a report on a reexamination of the Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington, N. C., was ordered to be printed, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF WAR DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6260) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

## APEX HOSIERY CASE—LETTER FROM SENATOR NORRIS

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Senator NORRIS to Gardner Jackson, of Labor's Nonpartisan League, relative to the Apex Hosiery case, which appears in the Appendix.]

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator REYNOLDS on June 10, 1939, on the subject of foreign affairs, which appears in the Appendix.]

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS—TELEGRAM TO SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. MINTON, for Mr. REYNOLDS, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram on the subject of foreign affairs, addressed to Senator REYNOLDS by O. G. Werner, of Dover, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY AT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF UTAH CHAPTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Postmaster General Farley at the annual convention of the Utah Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters at Salt Lake City, Utah, on May 22, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

## INDEPENDENCE OF THE PHILIPPINES—ADDRESS BY SALVADOR ARANETA

[Mr. GIBSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Salvador Araneta before the convocation program at the University of Manila, May 25, 1939, on the subject of the independence of the Philippines, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ATTITUDE OF MILWAUKEE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE TOWARD NATIONAL LEGISLATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the position of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Association of Commerce on legislation now pending before Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ARMY CHIEFS OF STAFF—LETTER BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers to the editor of the New York Times and printed in that newspaper on Sunday, June 4, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE N. Y. A. SLASH—ARTICLE BY ERNEST LINDLEY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Ernest Lindley, published in the Washington Post of June 11, 1939, entitled "The N. Y. A. Slash," which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials on the subject of the National Youth Administration, one published in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of Thursday, June 8, 1939, and the other in the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register of June 8, 1939, which appear in the Appendix.]

## ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no resolutions coming over from a preceding day and no further morning business, the calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the calendar be dispensed with for the time being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## IMPORTATION OF INFESTED BULBS

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, last Wednesday I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 143) asking for the appointment of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I asked that the resolution lie on the table. My understanding was that the resolution would come up under the order of resolutions coming over from a previous day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A tabled resolution does not come up automatically as a resolution coming over from the previous day. The Senator can move to take up his resolution.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I do not intend to make such a motion at this time, but I do wish to place in the RECORD some very brief remarks concerning the resolution.

The basis of the resolution was the action upon the part of the Department of Agriculture which would result in the abandonment by that Department of the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act so far as the importation of narcissus bulbs is concerned. I discussed the matter last Wednesday. It happens that yesterday in the Washington Star an article appeared which is of interest and importance so far as this particular resolution is concerned. In the article it is pointed out that, as a result of an obscure importation of iris bulbs from Japan in the year 1912, an importation which went only to one locality, there was brought into this country an infestation known as the Japanese beetle. That infestation spread from the place where the iris bulbs were originally planted to all sections of the country. We are now spending a total of three and a half million dollars a year as a result of the loss due to that particular infestation.

The author of the article in yesterday's Washington Star submits evidence to show that as a result of the infestation in that one obscure importation of Japanese iris bulbs there has been a total loss to this country of \$100,000,000.

It is all very well for the Department of Agriculture to say that it is proper, in order to enable the State Department to enter into trade negotiations and treaties with Holland so as to increase our trade, that the limitations which have been placed upon the importation of narcissus bulbs should be relaxed or abandoned. The total amount of importations of narcissus bulbs to this country prior to the time of the placing of the quarantine was about \$250,000 a year. I think it but fair to state that, as a result of a relaxation of the limitations of the Plant and Quarantine Act so far as the importation of narcissus bulbs is concerned, we cannot expect to get more out of Holland than the amount Holland would get coming in, or \$250,000 a year; and yet the evidence which I discussed last week shows that these bulbs are infested, and that the infestation is such as to spread rapidly, and spread to other agricultural products of this country.

Having seen the result of laxness on the part of this Government, so far as the importation of iris bulbs is concerned, at a cost to the people of this country of \$100,000,000, certainly no one can justify running a similar risk with narcissus bulbs in order to get trade to the amount of \$250,000 a year.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the article to which I have referred from the Washington Star of yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The article is as follows:

MADE IN JAPAN—A \$100,000,000 HEADACHE FOR AMERICA

(By J. D. Ratcliff)

No one paid any particular attention to the shipment of irises from Japan that passed by New York customs officials one day in

1912. There were other more important things to be considered in the vast bulk of imports—tea from Ceylon, woollens from England, dyes from Germany. So the irises slipped quietly through, carrying a cargo of passengers—minute white worms.

The worms looked even more insignificant than most worms; they were small and white—curled up as if they were suffering from a particularly violent stomach ache. The newspapers, of course, didn't note the entrance of the immigrant worms, but they might well have made headline news of the event. For the descendants of those worms were destined to become a national problem of major importance. These descendants have driven more than one orchardist into bankruptcy and have been the despair of home gardeners. At present they are costing the Nation well over \$3,500,000 a year, and this figure will continue to rise. All because of that shipment of irises.

Some of them went to Riverton, N. J., and were planted in home gardens. The small worms—or grubs—came to life after their long journey from the Orient. Conditions, they found, were eminently suitable for growth. The ground was warm and moist, and the climate was generally similar to the climate of their native island in Japan. They shed their skins and grew into larger grubs—some growing until they were nearly an inch long. They burrowed their way through the soil and got near enough to the surface to feed on the tender young roots of flowers and grass. The new country was thoroughly satisfactory. All of the natural enemies of the worms had been left behind in Japan, and all of the good points Japan had to offer were being duplicated in New Jersey.

After hibernating that first winter the grubs came to life the following spring. Once again they shed their skins. After losing these capsules they were no longer lowly worms. Instead they were rather handsome and splendid flying insects. Their small bodies, not much larger than a potato bug, were a pleasing metallic green and their wings were bronze. Members of the species *Popillia japonica* Newman began to make their way to the surface. It was mid-June when the first ones tried their wings. They flew to whatever vegetation was at hand—fruits, shrubs, vegetables.

Thus ends a circumstantial account of how the Japanese beetle arrived in the United States. Actually his presence went unnoticed until he was a problem of rather staggering proportions. Today he is a familiar sight in 22 States; and particularly those States along the North Atlantic seaboard.

The first beetle was found in August 1916. An employee of the New Jersey Department of Agriculture picked up one of the insects. Not recognizing it and being unable to classify it, he sent it to Washington. Authorities there had no better luck. They sent it to the British Museum. Word came back that it was the Japanese beetle. Better get busy.

Entomologists went to Japan to gather what information they could and field men pumped tens of thousands of gallons of insecticides on an arbitrary spray belt created around Riverton. The latter attempt was a complete failure. The beetles marched through the barrier as if it didn't exist. They spread to orchards, truck farms, and home gardens. In the grub stage they destroyed golf-course greens, eating off grass roots, and as adults they completely stripped shade trees of foliage. It was soon evident that the beetles couldn't be exterminated without sifting every ounce of topsoil in New Jersey in a search for grubs. Perhaps they could be controlled—a job that loomed large, since there were no known natural enemies capable of large-scale destruction to aid the entomologist.

Any war on insects must begin with a life study of the insect itself. His complete biography must be written. His food preferences, natural habits, love life, and stage of development are all important. Somewhere in the existence of any insect there is a weak link and it is here that the entomologist must attack. So every detail of the beetle's existence was given microscopic scrutiny—from egg to grub to the pretty flying insect.

It is in his final stage of life—as a flying insect—that the beetle does his greatest damage to crops. In a few days now he will begin to emerge from the ground to start his depredations. While he is known to eat 260 varieties of vegetation, he does have his food preferences—apples, cherries, and peaches; linden and horse-chestnut trees; and dahlias, zinnias, and hollyhocks. He prefers the hot mid-day sun and may very likely remain in the ground if the weather is bad. By nature the Japanese beetle is gregarious. If one discovers that the fleshy part of the leaves of a certain tree are tasty, tens of thousands of beetles will swarm after him. When their feeding is over leaves will be lacy skeletons with only veins remaining. They will attack fruits en masse and as many as 365 beetles have been found swarming over a single apple.

The beetle remains in his adult stage 30 to 45 days. He ends his days on earth with one final gorge of vegetation. During this brief span of adult life the females dig their way in the ground to deposit 40 to 60 eggs. A single square yard of earth has been found to contain as many as 1,500 larvae.

These and scores of other beetle facts have been uncovered at the research center at Moorestown, N. J., which is maintained by the Agriculture Department's Bureau of Entomology. There are 10 laboratories scattered over the 20-acre tract of leased land. Forty-odd men work in them, under the direction of C. H. Hadley, paternal, white-haired veteran of the ceaseless war against insects. For sake of simplicity Hadley prefers to consider *Popillia japonica* as two insects—a root-eating grub and a leaf-eating winged beetle. The fight against this destructive pair falls into two major lines: Large-scale control and protection of individual farms, gardens, or lawns.

For large-scale control work it became evident almost at the start that natural enemies would have to be imported from Japan. The



possibility of finding bacteria and protozoa that would prey on the beetles has received a great deal of study, but as yet nothing too promising has turned up here. Better luck has been encountered with prey insects. Altogether 17 of these have been brought into the country. Conditions in the United States have been suitable for the survival of only five, and of these five only two have been particularly effective. These two are related wasps—one from Korea, the other from Japan. Both are small and black and look like flying ants.

These wasps are ground borers and prey directly on the grub. The female pushes her way through the earth until she finds an unsuspecting grub. She stings it and the poison causes temporary paralysis. She then lays an egg which she attaches to the under part of the worm. When this egg hatches the larva sucks fluid nourishment from the grub. As the larva grows stronger the grub grows weaker. Completely ungrateful for the hospitality afforded him, the larva finally consumes the depleted body of his host. In the course of a summer a wasp will lay about 40 eggs which under ideal circumstances will destroy an equal number of potential beetles.

At the laboratory these wasps are stored in individual glass tubes during their period of hibernation. Usually there are about 50,000 of these tubes on hand. When ready for release in the field entomologists seek out likely spots. One hundred wasps represent the nucleus of the new community. A little over half of these colonies survive. Over 1,700 of them have been established in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, New York, and other infested States.

Researchers recently have been devoting study to another beetle killer, a parasitic roundworm. This minute worm, harmless to plants and man, lodges in the digestive track of the grubs and kills them. Experimental colonization already has begun.

Suppression of adult beetles is accomplished by means of sprays and traps. On the research farm work goes on constantly in an effort to find more effective sprays. Whole trees are enclosed in wire netting and then sprayed. Mortality among beetles left free inside this area is then checked. So far it appears that calcium arsenate is the most effective poison. If properly applied, it can protect all but 10 percent of any given orchard. Beetles if allowed to go unchecked, will destroy 70 percent of a fruit crop.

The effectiveness of traps depends on a discovery made early in the investigations. It was noted that the insects were attracted particularly by geraniums, sassafras, and smartweed—all of which give off pungent odors. Was there something in these odors that was responsible? This turned out to be the correct guess, the principal odor producer being the essential oil geraniol. Traps which diffuse this oil with a wet wick are highly effective in badly infested areas. With a 10-gallon capacity for insect storage they have been known to catch over 100,000 beetles in the space of a few days.

Ample protection for home gardens and lawns may be obtained by use of traps—which cost \$1 each—and insecticides. Large trees and shrubs are sprayed with a mixture consisting of 6 pounds of calcium or lead arsenate, 4 pounds of wheat flour, one-half pint of fish oil, and 100 gallons of water. This should be applied when the beetles start feeding. The necessity for repeated treatments is determined by the severity of the invasion. Lead arsenate applied to lawns at the rate of 10 pounds per thousand square feet should destroy all grubs for a period of about 5 years. Applied before a hard rain, or washed into the ground with a hose, the poison is carried out of the reach of pets.

Toads are enemies of the insects. Twenty-two percent of the stomach content of toads examined at the New Jersey experiment station consisted of beetles. Birds too consume quantities of beetles. Over half of those examined at the laboratory had eaten the insects. Starlings, cardinals, catbirds, meadowlarks, purple grackles, and pheasants had particularly voracious appetites for the pests. Birds experimentally colonized in badly infested areas have thrived and materially aided in the campaign of control.

These are the measures taken once the beetles have stormed and taken any given area. It is the job of the quarantine man to see that they are as nearly confined to one district as possible. His work has not been too successful. The beetles, despite all efforts and precautions, will normally spread out from any focal point in ever-widening waves. Each year these waves carry about 10 miles. Most authorities now agree that no suppressive measures can check this normal expansion. But vigilance can keep the pests from being carried to various communities in vegetable and fruit cargoes to set up new focal spots.

Inspection at packing sheds and in nurseries to see that all shipments are fumigated helps. So do the quarantine stations along main highways. The United States Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with State departments in Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere, maintain quarantine stations on main highways to keep motorists from carrying sweet corn, fruits, flowers, and other contraband outside the area. Still these precautions are not always wholly effective.

Beetles have spread from their original focal point in New Jersey into all the New England States and all Southern States except Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida. Islands of infestation have appeared as far west as Iowa.

Eventually the insects will probably be found to some extent in all the region between western Kansas and the Atlantic. West of this section winter cold or summer drought should keep them from becoming a major problem. As the work now stands, the chief job of the quarantine service is to retard the march into new areas while the research men seek new methods of attack.

All these efforts should bring the beetles under control—control consisting of limiting their annual damage to 5 or 10 percent of a crop in an infested area. Even so, they will continue to destroy several million dollars' worth of property per year, or an amount at least equal to the interest on a hundred-million-dollar investment. The innocent-looking little worms that were imported on the roots of irises meant to beautify some home garden have become a \$100,000,000 national headache.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6392, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none.

The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State, office of the Secretary of State", on page 2, line 8, before the word "Provided", to strike out "\$2,183,500" and insert "\$2,239,760", so as to read:

Salaries: For Secretary of State; Under Secretary of State, \$10,000; counselor, \$10,000; and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including temporary employees, and not to exceed \$6,500 for employees engaged on piece work at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of State, \$2,239,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses (departmental)", on page 4, line 22, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "\$138,000" and insert "\$143,430", so as to read:

Contingent expenses: For contingent and miscellaneous expenses, including stationery, furniture, fixtures; typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including rental, exchange and repair thereof (not to exceed \$27,500); purchase and exchange of books, maps, and periodicals, domestic and foreign, and, when authorized by the Secretary of State, dues for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members, newspapers, teletype rentals, and tolls (not to exceed \$12,000); purchase, including exchange, of one passenger-carrying automobile and two automobile mail wagons; maintenance, repair, and storage of motor-propelled vehicles, to be used only for official purposes (including one passenger-carrying vehicle for the Secretary of State and one for the general use of the Department); streetcar fare; traveling expenses, including not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Department of State when authorized by the Secretary of State; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for the issue of passports to persons who are exempted from the payment of such fee by section 1 of the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, approved June 4, 1920 (22 U. S. C. 214, 214a); the examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; and other miscellaneous items not included in the foregoing, \$143,430.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign intercourse", on page 7, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$640,000" and insert "\$650,000", so as to read:

In all, not to exceed \$650,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign Service building fund", on page 15, line 10, after the word "act", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$1,000,000"; and in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$300,000", so as to read:

Foreign Service Buildings Fund: For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An act to provide additional funds for buildings for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States" (52 Stat. 441),

including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said act, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended, and in addition the Secretary of State is authorized to enter into contracts for the acquisition of sites and preparation of plans during the fiscal year 1940 in an amount of not to exceed \$300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico", on page 25, after line 13, to insert:

Fence construction on the boundary, Arizona: For construction of fence along the international boundary as authorized by the act of August 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 660), \$25,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the acquisition of lands or easements for sites for boundary fences except for procurement of abstracts or certificates of title, payment of recording fees, and examination of titles.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Fisheries Commission", on page 28, line 24, after the word "State", to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$25,000", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For the share of the United States of the expenses of the International Fisheries Commission, under the convention between the United States and Canada, concluded January 29, 1937, including salaries of two members and other employees of the Commission, traveling expenses, charter of vessels, purchase of books, periodicals, furniture, and scientific instruments, contingent expenses, rent in the District of Columbia, and such other expenses in the United States and elsewhere as the Secretary of State may deem proper, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission", on page 29, line 15, after the word "State", to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$40,000", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For the share of the United States of the expenses of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, under the convention between the United States and Canada, concluded May 26, 1930, including personal services; traveling expenses; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; charter of vessels; purchase of books, periodicals, furniture, and scientific instruments; contingent expenses; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and such other expenses in the United States and elsewhere as the Secretary of State may deem proper, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Payment to Government of Nicaragua", on page 30, line 24, after the word "rendered", to strike out the comma and "in foreign countries"; and on page 31, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$300" and insert "\$100, or, with respect to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States, \$300", so as to read:

Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase by or service rendered for the Department of State when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$100, or, with respect to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States, \$300; or when the purchase or service relates to the packing of personal and household effects of Diplomatic, Consular, and Foreign Service officers and clerks for foreign shipment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice, office of the Attorney General", on page 32, line 12, after the word "Division", to strike out "\$190,000" and insert "\$210,000, of which sum \$50,000 shall be available for the investigation and prosecution of alleged violations of civil liberties", so as to read:

For the Criminal Division, \$210,000, of which sum \$50,000 shall be available for the investigation and prosecution of alleged violations of civil liberties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 15, after the word "Division", to strike out "\$285,000" and insert "\$314,220", so as to read:

For the Claims Division, \$314,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "\$1,984,300" and insert "\$2,033,520", so as to read:

Total, personal services, office of the Attorney General, \$2,033,520. Not to exceed 5 percent of the foregoing amounts shall be available interchangeably for expenditures in the various offices and divisions named, but not more than 5 percent shall be added to the amount appropriated for any one of said officers or divisions and any interchange of appropriations hereunder shall be reported to Congress in the annual Budget.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 11, after the word "provided" and the parenthesis, to strike out "\$925,000" and insert "\$950,000", so as to read:

Traveling expenses: For all necessary traveling expenses under the Department of Justice and the judiciary, including traveling expenses of probation officers and their clerks but not including traveling expenses otherwise payable under any appropriations for "United States Supreme Court," "United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals," "United States Customs Court," "Court of Claims," "United States Court for China," "Federal Bureau of Investigation," "Salaries and expenses of marshals," "Fees of jurors and witnesses," and "Penal and correctional institutions" (except as otherwise hereinbefore provided), \$950,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I know it is regarded as quite improper to question appropriation bills. The assumption is that whatever is asked for we grant, and sometimes regret is expressed that more was not asked for. I know that an objection to any item in an appropriation bill meets with opposition, and, of course, is futile.

I should like, however, to have the Senator in charge of the bill, or some other Senator, state how much more than the appropriation for last year is carried in this bill for the departments covered by it; and, if there is an increase—as there is—what is the necessity for such a large increase.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there is an increase. However, the increase in the bill as reported by the Senate committee over the bill as it was passed by the House for all three departments is only \$1,225,290. The principal items of which that increase is made up are increases in the expenses of our various agencies abroad.

I will say to the Senator that the State Department asked for very moderate amounts. The increases are comparatively small; and the committee, as I recall, reported the amendments unanimously. There has been no division about them. They are very proper items.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Nevada. I may state that under our rule the Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, occupied a place in the Committee on Appropriations when the State Department items were taken up; and he can give the Senate such views as he has regarding them.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I simply wish to endorse what the Senator from Tennessee has said. For many years the State Department has made a practice of very carefully going over its estimates. I have never known the Department to attempt to exaggerate its requirements. All of these amendments were approved by the Budget Bureau in the first place, and were slightly cut down in the House. They have not been entirely restored by the Senate committee, but have in part been restored by the Senate committee.

The subcommittee had before it the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Messersmith, who carefully explained each item, and answered all questions touching the amendments. I think there is no doubt about the justice of the action of the whole committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may continue along the line of the Senator's statement, the principal item of increase in the bill in the State Department is the foreign Service building fund, an item of \$500,000.

As Senators know, several years ago we passed a bill providing for a building fund of a million dollars a year. The House cut the building fund of \$1,000,000 a year to \$500,000. The Senate committee restored the amount which the Congress had authorized, that being the amount of the Budget estimate. That constitutes the principal increase in the bill.



Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, may I add a word on that subject?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I shall be glad to have my friend do so.

Mr. PITTMAN. As to the item of a million dollars a year, 2 years ago the Congress authorized an appropriation of \$1,000,000 a year for 5 years for a foreign building program. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives are ex officio members of the Building Commission, which is otherwise departmental. I have been attending the meetings of the Commission since I became chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, over a period of 6 years. The Commission has very carefully segregated the buildings which are absolutely essential at the present time, basing its judgment not so much upon the dignity of the Government as upon actual sanitary requirements. In certain places the sanitary conditions are extremely dangerous for anyone who has to live there. The appropriation of a million dollars for the ensuing year is absolutely necessary in order to take care of the buildings in those places and to safeguard the health of those whom we send to live there, and it would not be possible to get along with any less.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee, or the State Department, whether there has been any increase in the item on page 9, "Office and living quarters allowances," over previous years?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will let the Senator know in just a moment. I desire to state that the next large increase is the item of \$79,360 for a central translating office. The Government does not have one at this time, and such an office should be established in the State Department. The committee allowed \$79,360 for a central translating office, and the salaries which will be required. The committee was strongly of the opinion that this appropriation should be made.

There is another small item of \$25,000 for continuing a fence between Mexico and the United States near one of the cities on the border. The committee approved that item.

Mr. President, I believe this is a very reasonable bill, and one which the Senate undoubtedly will approve.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, has the Senator explained the increases in the Department of Commerce appropriations?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; we have not yet gotten to that Department.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well. I thought the Senator was making a general statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was asking me about the living quarters appropriation, which he will find on page 9, and I will make an explanation.

Last year \$1,962,000 was allowed. The estimate this year was for \$2,030,000; the House appropriated \$2,020,000, and the Senate committee endorsed the House provision.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator a further question about the State Department budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that our foreign representation, which heretofore has been divided between the Departments of Commerce, State, and Agriculture, is now to be concentrated. Does the concentration reflect itself in any increased cost of operating the State Department, and will the Senator also tell me at the same time whether it is reflected in any reduction in the appropriation for the Commerce Department?

Mr. McKELLAR. It does not affect the State Department. It does not go into effect until the 1st of July, as the Senator knows.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is when the pending bill will go into effect.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct, but we have no experience as to the cost. I imagine it will cost somewhat more.

That is a mere guess, because it is difficult at this time, before we have had any experience, to tell definitely.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We were told that the use of the reorganization function and the concentration of the foreign services in one place represented an economy.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope that will be the effect of it, but, so far as I can see now, I do not know where it will come about.

Mr. VANDENBERG. At any rate, it is not reflected in the pending bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not reflected in the pending bill. It may be reflected, however, next year, and I hope it will be, and I hope the Senator will ask me about it at that time, if he shall still be on the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there will be a transfer of commercial attachés from the Department of Commerce to the State Department. Whether or not there will be a reduction in the number of commercial attachés has not been stated. I think the consolidation will result in a reduction in the number of commercial attachés, who now report to the Department of Commerce, and who will subsequently report to the State Department, because the intention is not to have a commercial attaché at the same place where there is a consul, since the consuls and the commercial attachés have been performing practically the same work, one reporting to the Department of Commerce and the other to the Department of State.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Where are the commercial attachés provided for in the pending bill? Are they under the Department of Commerce or under the Department of State?

Mr. PITTMAN. They will be under the Department of State.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the appropriation for them under the Department of State?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is under the Department of Commerce in the bill, but they will be transferred to the State Department. The Senator asked me whether there was any economy reflected in the bill, and I told him that there was not. I think it is fair that I explain that for the present year, largely because of the changes themselves, there is an increased cost of about \$20,000 in all reflected in the bill. I think next year there ought to be a substantial decrease, and I hope there will be, but we cannot say now, because we all understand how difficult it is to foresee what may happen.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am not quite satisfied with the explanation which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee with respect to the effect of the transfer of the activities of the agency dealing with foreign commerce to the Department of State. When it was suggested a number of years ago that we should create this agency in the Department of Commerce for the investigation of foreign trade and allied matters I was very much opposed to it. I believed that all the activities in connection with foreign nations should be conducted through the State Department. But after we held the bill up for perhaps one or two sessions the pressure became so great that it was passed.

If I may be pardoned a personal reference, I recall that while in London a few years ago I found that we had representatives there of the Department of Agriculture; we had five or six agencies of the Department of the Treasury, some of the Department of Commerce, as well as representatives of the Department of State. I recall that a telegram came from Sicily to a representative of the State Department in the Embassy to the effect that a blight of some kind was affecting the potatoes in Sicily which might affect the potato crop in the United States. He immediately sent a cablegram to the Department of State. Within a short time a cablegram was sent to the United States from representatives of the Department of Agriculture who had received the information from the Department of State; then another

cablegram was sent by a representative of the Department of Commerce making the same statement. A cablegram also came from a representative of our Treasury Department in Berlin making the same statement. There were six or seven or eight cablegrams from six or seven or eight representatives of the departments of our Government with respect to one small item having to do with the suspicion that there was some blight in the potato crop in Sicily.

Mr. President, that illustrates that we have had abroad, more so in the past, perhaps, than now, too many employees of too many departments. I know that when I was in Germany there were six or seven representatives of the Treasury Department there, as well as representatives of the State Department, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Agriculture. Wherever one went he would find not one but scores of representatives of our Government's agencies, and the work was done by the State Department.

If we can concentrate our foreign activities in the State Department, it will make for economy. But examining the bill, I do not see that anything has been subtracted from the Department of Commerce by reason of uniting the foreign services in the Department of State.

I think we are increasing the appropriations instead of reducing them. There is no semblance of economy in the bill, according to my view, or in any of the appropriation bills which have been brought to our attention at the present session of the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator about the lack of good, sound, governmental judgment in having so many departments represented abroad. I think the pending proposal is a step in the right direction. I agree with the Senator that these matters have to be conducted in the end by State Department officials, and therefore we might better have them attend to them in the first instance, and have all the employees and officials abroad under the State Department. I think that would be very wise.

It is true that by reason of the transfer and the change from one department to the other the cost for the next fiscal year will be \$30,000 greater.

I stated a while ago to the Senator from Michigan that the increase would be about \$20,000. The House increase amounted to \$19,300, and \$11,000 was added by the Senate committee, making \$30,300 in the way of increases brought about by the change in the departments. I think the appropriation can be reduced somewhat next year, but that is a problem which will have to be dealt with next year, and it is a mere surmise now as to whether it can be done.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do I understand the Senator from Tennessee to say that the consolidation, therefore, so far as the pending bill is concerned, has resulted in an increase in the appropriation for the State Department, and no decrease in the appropriation for the Commerce Department?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course there will be a decrease in the appropriation for the Commerce Department when the consolidation takes place. But I am talking about the actual cost of the service in question as affected in this bill. That was the Senator's question. The actual cost will be \$30,300 more in the two Departments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So the reorganization on that point represents a \$30,000 increase of cost in the next fiscal year?

Mr. McKELLAR. Thirty thousand dollars, which, legislatively speaking, is very small, and I think next year it will be reduced very considerably. I hope it will, and I certainly will do everything I can to have it reduced.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that this increase of \$30,000 is not due to the reorganization. It probably might have been increased to a larger sum except for the reorganization; is that not true?

Mr. McKELLAR. A considerable portion of it grows out of the reorganization. Certain allowances are given the State Department which have never been given the Commerce Department. That is the immediate cause of a large part of the increase of \$30,000. If we had increased the salaries of the employees in the Commerce Department it

would have brought about the same result. Instead of that, their allowances were increased.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the statement of the able Senator from Kentucky that he had the consolation that we might have had a still greater increase except for the reorganization reminds me of the note that James Madison sent to his neighbor who had thoughtfully sent over a cure for his cold. He wrote back and said:

While I cannot say that your cure has done me any good, neither can I say that my cold would not have been worse if I had not taken it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken. There is no doubt in the world about it being manifestly to the advantage of the Government that these commercial offices be under the State Department rather than under the Department of Commerce.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree completely.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator does.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am simply discussing whether or not we saved any money by it.

Mr. McKELLAR. With the increase in business which we have, if we can get along by never increasing the appropriation for this Department more than \$30,000 in any one year, we will be doing wonderfully well, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. The position of commercial attaché was created when Mr. Hoover, who subsequently became President, was Secretary of Commerce. I had the opportunity to visit a great many foreign cities shortly after the commercial attachés were appointed, and I found out at that time that there was a duplication of service by the consular officers and the commercial attachés wherever both offices existed.

The purpose of this provision is to reduce the number of commercial attachés wherever we have consulates. It may be necessary or advisable, of course, to keep commercial attachés at certain places where we have no consulates, so that they can attend to commercial business. But it is evident that as soon as the situation with respect to commercial attachés and consuls can be adjusted, a saving must necessarily result.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KING. As a supplemental statement, I may say that in my travels through Europe I have discovered that the representatives of the Department of Commerce were not received with any great favor by the business agencies, but a representative of the Department of State had no difficulty in obtaining the information desired from the various business agencies.

I further discovered that because it was not available to them, many representatives of the Department of Commerce obtained their information from the consular representatives and the State Department. So the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, in my opinion, served no useful purpose, and the officials of that Bureau had to resort to the State Department representatives and to the consular agents in order to obtain the information which they transmitted to the United States and claimed the credit for, but the credit was due to representatives of the State Department in the Consular and Diplomatic Service.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator has not yet come to the particular part of the bill to which I wish to refer; but if the Senator would be good enough to answer, I should like to ask a question now, because I am obliged to leave the Chamber. On page 20, line 10, an appropriation of \$168,528.23 is provided for the International Labor Organization. Will the Senator give an explanation of that particular item and why that appropriation is made?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a House provision which the Senate committee did not change. I will have to look at the



House hearings and I will give the Senator the explanation. The provision reads:

International Labor Organization, \$168,528.28, including not to exceed \$25,867 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the meetings of the general conference and of the governing body of the International Labor Office and in such regional, industrial, or other special meetings—

And so forth. Is that the item to which the Senator refers?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read from the House hearing on that subject. I quote from Mr. Messersmith, who, as the Senator knows, is Assistant Secretary of State:

Mr. MESSERSMITH. I think with respect to the increases in the individual contributions to the various commissions and international organizations to which we belong, they have been small. The considerable increase to which you refer I think has been caused by our participation in the International Labor Office, and that, of course, is the largest individual contribution that our Government makes.

Mr. CARTER. Do you know approximately what that is?

Mr. MESSERSMITH. The contribution for the International Labor Office as submitted in this budget is \$168,661.28.

Mr. CARTER. I was wondering if you thought if any of these became obsolete and useless they might be dispensed with.

Mr. MESSERSMITH. We go from year to year into an examination of these international bodies to which we belong in order to determine whether the Department should take any initiative in recommending to the Congress that it is no longer desirable for us to participate in any of these organizations. I am sure that, so far as the organizations are concerned which appear in these estimates, the Department would have no such recommendation to make.

That seems to have satisfied the House, and it put the item in the bill.

These appropriations, as the Senator knows, are made yearly. As I remember the International Labor Organizations' meetings are held under treaties and conventions between our country and foreign countries, and having entered into those obligations, it is absolutely necessary to appropriate the money. The meetings are not held as the result of action on the part of the Appropriations Committee. These appropriations are necessary because of laws or treaties which the Congress and the President have entered into, and that is why the appropriation is made in the present instance.

Mr. DAVIS. There is no detailed statement in the hearings as to what the appropriation is to be expended for; it is simply a general statement, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will get the information and insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the Senator insert it in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will put it in the RECORD at this point, yes.

The information presented by Mr. McKELLAR for the RECORD, is as follows:

<i>International Labor Organization (Geneva, Switzerland)—Basic appropriation</i>	
Appropriation for 1939:	
Quota.....	\$132,741.39
Expenses of attending meetings.....	25,000.00
Total.....	157,741.39
Increases requested for 1940:	
Quota.....	9,919.89
Expenses of attending meetings.....	1,000.00
Total.....	10,919.89
Estimate for 1940:	
Quota.....	142,661.28
Expenses of attending meetings.....	26,000.00
Total.....	168,661.28

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KING. I recur to the item to which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] referred, and to which I have called attention. Notwithstanding the consolidation of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce with the Department of State, I find that there is an appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for the next year of \$3,122,000—\$83,000 more than during the past year. So,

instead of there being some reduction in the expenses as a result of the consolidation, we have increased the appropriations for that particular agency by \$83,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Utah is mistaken about it. The increase of which I spoke awhile ago is \$30,300. The amount which the Senator has just mentioned, the record of which I do not seem to have, is for all the activities, including the particular activities under consideration, but the appropriations for the officials who are transferred to the State Department will be deducted from the Commerce Department appropriations.

Mr. KING. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the report which was submitted, under the head of "Department of Commerce."

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is referring to the House report?

Mr. KING. The House report. Under the head of "Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Bureau of," I find the item "Washington Commerce Service, salaries and expenses." The appropriation for 1939 was \$543,800. The amount recommended in the bill is \$555,000, or an increase of \$11,200.

That is not all. When we come to the item of "Domestic commerce and raw materials investigations—"

Mr. McKELLAR. That item is exactly the same as it was last year. That item is not affected by the transfer.

Mr. KING. There is no increase in that item, but with the consolidation it seems to me there ought to be a reduction.

Under the item "District and cooperative offices, maintenance," the appropriation for 1939 was \$233,000. The amount recommended in the bill is \$350,000, or an increase of \$27,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the Senator is mistaken. The increase is \$10,000.

Mr. KING. I beg the Senator's pardon. I am reading from the figures in the House report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the item "District and cooperative offices, maintenance"—

Mr. KING. The increase is \$27,000, as I stated; so the Senator ought to confess that he was in error, and not I.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. The Senate committee increased the item. The Senator is correct. I thought the Senator was reading from different figures.

Mr. KING. I know what I am reading.

Under the heading "Export industries," the appropriation for 1939 was \$530,000. The amount recommended in the bill for 1940 is \$540,000, or an increase of \$10,000. In view of the consolidation, there ought to be a reduction; but, instead of that, there is an increase.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will refer to the item "District and cooperative offices, maintenance," he will find that the House recommended \$350,000. The Budget estimate for 1940 was \$313,000; and the appropriation for 1939 is \$323,000.

Mr. KING. I am interested only in showing that instead of a reduction, we have an increase of \$27,000 in that particular item.

Mr. McKELLAR. I assume the Senator is talking about the foreign offices which have been transferred to the State Department. So far as they are concerned, there has been an increase of \$30,300, and that is all.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am calling attention to the report, which shows that in the items to which I have referred there has been a consistent increase. In the particular item to which I referred there is an increase of \$27,000 over last year, notwithstanding the consolidation.

The item of "Export industries" is increased from \$530,000 to \$540,000, an increase of \$10,000.

The item of "Foreign Commerce Service, salaries and expenses" carried an appropriation for 1939 of \$764,500. The amount recommended in the bill is \$791,000, or an increase of \$26,500, notwithstanding the consolidation. Even assuming that there is to be or has been a transfer of these agencies to the Department of State under the consolidation, we find an increase in the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will look on page 62 of the bill, he will find the item "District and Cooperative Office Service," about which he is talking. Last year \$323,000 was appropriated, and the Budget Bureau estimate for 1940 was \$313,000. The House fixed the amount at \$350,000, and the Senate committee reduced it from \$350,000 to \$313,000; so there is a small saving made in that item.

Mr. KING. I am calling attention to the House report, which shows an increase of \$27,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Here is the bill. We are not legislating on the House report. We are legislating on the bill as reported by the Senate committee.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator advise the Senate what the reduction is in that particular item?

Mr. McKELLAR. The item shows on its face a reduction of \$37,000.

Mr. KING. And yet under the consolidation, which was assumed to effectuate reforms, we find that the appropriation for 1940 is proposed to be \$313,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. As against \$323,000 for the previous year.

Mr. KING. At any rate, the appropriation is more than \$300,000, so there is no material reduction.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator wishes to be fair to the committee.

Mr. KING. I am merely quoting from the House report.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the Senator wishes to be fair to the committee. How can we tell what will be the effect of consolidation prior to its going into effect? It will not go into effect until July 1.

Mr. KING. I assume, Mr. President, that we are passing appropriation bills to meet the requirements of the Government for the next year.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are.

Mr. KING. I assume that the various committees make inquiry as to what will be required in every agency of the Government, and then recommend appropriations accordingly.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have done so.

Mr. KING. With respect to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, in all the items to which I have called attention, I ask the Senator whether or not the committee report, by and large, calls for a larger appropriation than was made before the consolidation? I should like to ask the Senator whether his committee or the House committee took into account the fact that there was to be a consolidation; and whether or not anything in the testimony, in the hearings, or in the report indicates that there has been a reduction in the number of employees, or a reduction in the cost of the various agencies. I think the Senator will be compelled to answer in the negative.

I am merely calling attention to the fact that thus far the consolidation has not effected any reform. When the consolidation bills were before us for discussion, some of us predicted that there would be no reduction in expenses; and we now have a verification of the position which we took on the floor of the Senate when the consolidation bills were under consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be entirely true in the estimate of the Senator; but the Senator is merely making an estimate of his own. We have not had any experience with what the increases or the reductions may be. The Senator knows that the estimates were submitted last December or January. They were made prior to last December. They were made for the departments as they then were. Transfers have been made from the Commerce Department to the State Department. Because of the transfers an additional sum of \$30,300 has been provided. That is the entire question. Whether there will be a reduction or an increase, or whether the amounts will remain the same cannot be determined until after we have had some experience with the matter.

Mr. KING. The Senator stated that the Budget estimate—

Mr. McKELLAR. The Budget estimate was made prior to the new year; but the hearings, of course, were subsequent.

Mr. KING. The Budget estimate was based upon a continuation of the status quo. Suppose the Bureau of the Budget had assumed that a certain agency would be continued, and had recommended an appropriation of \$1,000,000, and Congress had abolished that agency. Certainly the Senator would not contend that we ought to continue the \$1,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed not; but that is not the question before us. We may suppose anything; but that is not the question before us. The question before us is, Has there been an increase or a decrease as a result of the transfer from the Department of Commerce to the Department of State?

I have told the Senator that there has been an increase of \$30,300. That is true. It had to be made, because the cost was that much greater. The amount is not very large; but we cannot tell whether there will be an increase or a decrease until we have had experience.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion that we can tell. Whenever we set up an agency, even if we later abolish it or transfer it, the costs increase as the years go by. The consolidation has not effected any reform. It has not reduced expenses. On the contrary, as the Senator himself confesses, it has increased the appropriations over those of last year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I notice that we are still appropriating \$10,000 apiece for ministers to Albania and Czechoslovakia. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. McKELLAR. The explanation is that the offices in Panama, Colombia, and one other South or Central American country have been raised from the status of ministerial offices to ambassadorial offices, which necessitates an increase of \$22,500. The \$10,000 for Czechoslovakia is to be used to aid in the payment of the increased salaries brought about by the change from ministerial offices to ambassadorial offices.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The trouble with that explanation is that on page 6 full salaries of \$17,500 each are provided for the Ambassadors to Colombia, Panama, and the other countries about which the Senator is talking.

Mr. McKELLAR. To what page is the Senator referring?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Page 6.

Mr. McKELLAR. The reason why that is done is that I do not think our Government has ever formally admitted that Czechoslovakia has been taken over by the German Government. It has been so taken over, but that action has not been recognized by our Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the Senator's answer as to the additional \$10,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the answer. A lump sum is appropriated, but there is taken into consideration the matter of lapses. For instance, if an Ambassador or Minister dies, and it is 3 months before another is appointed, there is a small sum which is saved. The Department, with the greatest accuracy, keeps an account of the money thus saved. They figure on so many lapses each year. The amounts involved usually are very small, and especially in the third year of an administration they are always small. I am so informed, and so the witnesses say. For that reason the appropriation could not be reduced any more than the committee has provided in this bill. I assure the Senator that there is no lagniappe or anything similar in this appropriation. Every cent of the money is accounted for; every cent of it is paid to the Ambassadors or to the Ministers, as the case may be.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no doubt of that, and neither have I any doubt that the State Department is one of the most economically operated departments of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. I assure the Senator that is true. I think the State Department is one of the most economically conducted departments of our Government. I do not mean to reflect on other departments, but certainly the officers of the State Department are exceedingly careful with the Government's money at all times.



Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree to all that. I am simply complaining about what seems to me to be the historical stultification of Congress in appropriating specifically for Ministers to Albania and Czechoslovakia, both of which nations have expired, unless the Senator from Tennessee expects them to regain their sovereignty within the next 12 months.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Tennessee does not expect any such thing; but if the Senator from Michigan will look on page 7 he will find the lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And I notice it has been increased, too.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been increased by \$10,000. The departments say they are obliged to have \$10,000 over the amount provided by the House. If the appropriation were made in the full amount called for by all the salaries, it would be considerably greater; it would probably run it up to approximately \$690,000,000; but there will be lapses, for instance, in the amount that would be paid to a minister to Czechoslovakia, which are taken into consideration; but, as an offset, we expect to increase the rank of our representatives in two South American countries and one Central American country from ministerial officers to ambassadorial officers, which will mean an increase in their salaries of \$7,500 a year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I call the Senator's attention again to the fact that that is not an explanation, inasmuch as those salaries are specifically increased on page 6.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me call the Senator's attention to a few lines of the testimony taken by the House committee:

Mr. DAVIS. \* \* \* The easiest way to handle this is to add \$12,500, which would be the equivalent of taking out \$10,000 for the minister at Czechoslovakia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Why not take out \$10,000 for Albania?

Mr. DAVIS. The minister is still there.

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, he might as well move.

If the Senator will look on page 123 of the House hearings, he will find the full explanation as to the exact amount that is absolutely necessary in this bill. The House in its figures did not provide sufficient by \$10,000. The Senate committee has appropriated the additional \$10,000, and we are going to take it to conference if the Senate agrees to it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What the Senator now says has no bearing upon his previous explanation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not see how the explanation could be misunderstood. Whatever the Senator might say about particular countries, if he will add up the various amounts he will find that it would be about \$690,000,000, all told, if the full appropriation were made, but because of lapses, because of reductions by reason of lapses and changes, the Department figures they can get on with \$650,000, which is less than the salaries amount to if they were appropriated for in full. The Senator would realize that if he would add up all the figures.

Mr. VANDENBERG. All I am trying to say is that the Senator told me the Department had to have an extra \$20,000 in order to pay ambassadorial salaries in Colombia and Panama.

Mr. McKELLAR. I could not have said that to the Senator, for the reason that we have appropriated only \$10,000 more than the House allowed. The House allowed \$640,000, and the Senate committee has increased it by \$10,000. I explained to the Senator, or undertook to explain to him, that there would be lapses. I presume the Department is figuring on lapses in Albania; they are certainly figuring on one in Czechoslovakia; but there have got to be taken into consideration the three increases, two in South American countries and one in a Central American country, where the salaries of our representatives will be increased by \$7,500.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What I am trying to say to the Senator is that that \$7,500 increase is specifically appropriated for in line 19 on page 6.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a part of the aggregate sum of \$650,000. If the Senator will add the figures, he will find that the "specific" sums appropriated are not specific at all,

but all the salaries in question must come out of the total aggregate of \$650,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not find any appropriation for our Ambassador at Large, Mr. Norman Davis. Does that indicate that we are to do without the pleasure of an Ambassador at Large for the next 12 months.

Mr. McKELLAR. He is not appropriated for in this bill. I do not know whether or not his services can be dispensed with. I imagine if the administration feels it cannot dispense with his services, his salary will be paid out of the lapses to which I have already called the attention of the Senator. I think that our Ambassador at Large has done a good work. He happens to come from my State; I know him intimately; he is a fine man; and I think he has done excellent work. If the Senator thinks otherwise, he and I differ.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If he comes from the Senator's State, that explains his long tenure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 33, line 11, to strike out \$925,000 and insert \$950,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous objects, Department of Justice", on page 37, line 21, after the figures "\$1,300,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That none of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of regional offices of the Antitrust Division: *Provided further*, That in the expenditure of the funds herein appropriated for the presentation or prosecution of cases under the antitrust laws such presentation or prosecution shall be in cooperation with the respective Federal district attorneys of the districts in which such cases are presented or prosecuted: *Provided further*, That any person paid from this appropriation an annual salary of \$5,000 or more shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," so as to read:

Enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws: For the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, including experts at such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General except that the compensation paid to any person employed hereunder shall not exceed the rate of \$10,000 per annum, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$1,300,000: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of regional offices of the Antitrust Division: *Provided further*, That in the expenditure of the funds herein appropriated for the presentation or prosecution of cases under the antitrust laws such presentation or prosecution shall be in cooperation with the respective Federal district attorneys of the districts in which such cases are presented or prosecuted: *Provided further*, That any person paid from this appropriation an annual salary of \$5,000 or more shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment on pages 37 and 38. The second proviso now reads:

*Provided further*, That any person paid from this appropriation an annual salary of \$5,000 or more shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

I move to strike that out, and to insert:

*Provided further*, That any person appointed at an annual salary of \$5,000 or more shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

It is proposed to modify the amendment in that way so as to make it apply to this appropriation only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment of the committee. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 38 it is proposed to strike out the proviso beginning after the word "prosecuted", in line 3, and in lieu thereof to insert:

That any person appointed at an annual salary of \$5,000 or more shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is the logical interpretation of the amendment as reported by the committee; but, in order to make it absolutely certain, I offer the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I enquire what is done with the amendment on page 38? The Senator read the proviso on page 38. Does he now propose to alter it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The second proviso as printed in lines 3 to 6, inclusive, on page 38 is changed so as to make it apply only to officers paid out of this appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That would be so under the provision as it now stands, would it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so, but, in order to make it absolutely sure, the language is proposed to be changed somewhat.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It seems to me the language now in the bill says just that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not understand why the amendment to the amendment should be offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the opinion of the Department the provision as now worded might apply to officers whose salaries are provided for under other appropriations in this bill. It was the intention to make it apply only to those provided for by the particular appropriation. The provision relates to new officers, and under it those who are paid more than \$5,000 salary must be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Exactly.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what the Senator wishes, and I am sure that is what the Senate wishes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is exactly what it says.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 19, after the word "attorney", to strike out "\$3,160,000" and insert "\$3,200,000", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses of district attorneys, etc.: For salaries and expenses of United States district attorneys and their regular assistants, clerks, and other employees, including the office expenses of United States district attorneys in Alaska, and for salaries of regularly appointed clerks to United States district attorneys for services rendered during vacancy in the office of the United States district attorney, \$3,200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marshals and other expenses of United States courts", on page 41, line 24, after the word "marshals", to strike out "\$3,875,000" and insert "\$3,900,000", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses of marshals, etc.: For salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies, including services rendered in behalf of the United States or otherwise; services in Alaska in collecting evidence for the United States when so specifically directed by the Attorney General; traveling expenses; purchase, when authorized by the Attorney General, of 10 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vans at not to exceed \$2,000 each; and maintenance, alteration, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles used in connection with the transaction of the official business of the United States marshals; \$3,900,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Penal and correctional institutions", on page 46, line 9, after the word "equipment", to insert a comma and "National Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C.", so as to read:

Buildings and equipment, National Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C.: For alterations of and repairs to buildings, including not to exceed \$150,000 for construction of a building to provide dining rooms, kitchens, and other domestic facilities, and including the purchase and installation of machinery and equipment, and all expenses incident thereto, to be expended so as to give the maximum amount of employment to inmates of the institution, \$208,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 22, after the word "Provided", to strike out "That no part of this sum shall be used to defray the salary or expenses of any probation officer whose work fails to comply with the standards promulgated by the Attorney General, and no part may be used for the payment of compensation of new probation officers who, in the judgment of the Attorney General, do not have proper qualifications as prescribed by him: *Provided further*," so as to read:

Probation system, United States courts: For salaries and expenses of probation officers, as authorized by the act entitled "An act to amend the act of March 4, 1925, chapter 521, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1930 (18 U. S. C. 726), \$776,000: *Provided*, That United States probation officers may be allowed, in lieu of actual expenses of transportation, not to exceed 3 cents per mile for the use of their own automobiles for transportation when traveling on official business within the city limits of their official station.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. It has been my habit to follow, in matters such as those involved in this item, the leadership of the Senator from Tennessee. I have reluctance in attempting to overthrow, even if I could, action taken by the Committee on Appropriations after they have given careful consideration to a matter, but I do not perceive the wisdom of this amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator long enough to explain just why the change was made?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. The law now provides that the probation officers shall be appointed by the district judges. This provision would virtually repeal that law. I call the Senator's attention to the language:

*Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be used to defray the salary or expenses of any probation officer whose work—

Listen to this:

fails to comply with the standards promulgated by the Attorney General, and no part may be used for the payment of compensation of new probation officers who, in the judgment of the Attorney General, do not have proper qualifications as prescribed by him.

That provision, in effect, would turn over to the Attorney General, the appointment of all probation officers, and take it out of the hands of the various district judges of the country, without expressly repealing the law, because without the money to pay the probation officers, of course, there would not be any probation officers. My opinion is that the judges, who now under the law have the right to appoint probation officers, ought either to be permitted to exercise that right, or the law ought to be repealed and the power put in the hands of the Attorney General.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the following letter which I have received from Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, as the letter contains the only argument I could make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
BUREAU OF PRISONS,  
Washington, June 12, 1939.

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: Knowing of your great interest in the work of this Department, I am taking the liberty of calling your attention to a change which has been made in our appropriations act affecting the probation system and which will, I think, seriously handicap our efforts to improve the probation system. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate has deleted the language contained on page 46, line 22 ff., of H. R. 6392, which gives the Department of Justice authority to set the standards for selection of probation officers as well as authority to require that their work be performed according to prescribed standards.

There are now approximately 28,000 men and women on probation to the 193 Federal probation officers distributed throughout the country. There are also about 5,000 ex-prisoners who have been released on parole and who are likewise under their supervision.

To promote the orderly integration of the probation system with the other work of the Prison Bureau and the several Federal courts, the language referred to was included some years ago in our



appropriation bill. It permits us to decline to allocate funds to those officers who do not comply with the very reasonable standards promulgated by the Department. We have, as a matter of fact, found it necessary to suspend payments in only five or six instances, but the fact that we have this authority has been most salutary and helpful in raising standards. The passage of the bill without this language would severely handicap our efforts to develop the probation service throughout the United States in a uniform manner and maintain the high standards already established. Furthermore, since the probation officers also supervise those released from Federal penal and correctional institutions on parole, the elimination of statutory authority to control the type of supervision which should be accorded a parolee would greatly handicap the work of our Federal parole system. You will recall that the recent National Parole Conference found that the lack of uniform standards for parole supervision in various jurisdictions was one of the gravest defects in parole administration.

The probation officers also are required by law to perform a considerable amount of work directly for the Department of Justice, and it would impede the effectiveness of our work if we had no voice in prescribing the methods to be followed in the performance of these duties.

Also it seems clear that there should be definite standards established to guide the courts in the selection of their probation personnel. We have never sought to impose our views as to the individuals whom the judges may select for their probation staff, but we have suggested in general language the qualifications which incumbents of these positions should have. Almost all of the judges have found it helpful to have these suggestions and have made their selections accordingly. In those few instances where candidates have been proposed who did not meet these standards the Department has granted an exception wherever possible. If, for any reason, the Congress should feel that this authority to promulgate standards for selection of personnel should not be delegated to this Department, I would see no objection to granting it to the Supreme Court or to the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges. It is important only that there be suitable standards, uniform in nature, and carefully drafted, which may be used by this Department and by the courts in making their personnel selections.

There is enclosed a suggestion for substitute language granting the authority to promulgate personnel standards to the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges in case you feel that this would be more acceptable.

I believe that an important aspect of the Government's law-enforcement activities will be seriously handicapped if the appropriation bill is passed without providing authority to impose uniform standards for the probation service. I hope, therefore, that you will find it possible to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate for their consideration.

With renewed appreciation for your interest,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES V. BENNETT, Director.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator if he happens to have the rules and regulations now in force in the matter of these appointments?

Mr. ASHURST. I have not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that one of the regulations is that a man either shall have a college degree or shall have had so many years in college. I have no objection at all to persons who have college degrees, or who have the good fortune to be college men. I happen to be one myself, and I am not going to criticize them; but I know a great many men who would make first-class probation officers who have never had a college degree, and I do not think they ought to be excluded.

We have a law giving to district judges the power and the right and imposing upon them the duty of selecting their probation officers. The judges are on the ground. They know what kind of a man will make a good officer. The idea of holding an examination, and having an officer here in Washington pass upon a man's qualifications or lack of qualifications; the idea of having an officer here, for instance, say, "Your man may be all right, but he has not the college training that we think he ought to have, and therefore we are going to disapprove the judge's selection," is something that I do not think ought to be allowed.

In the debate in the House of Representatives, a distinguished Member of that body whom the Senator knows very well, Mr. HOBBS—who, by the way, is a Representative from my old State and my old county in Alabama—said that the provision in question should be stricken out of the bill for the following reasons:

First, it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

It is a clear case of legislation. At present the law is that the district judges shall appoint these officials. If this provision is adopted by the Senate, the Attorney General or the parole officer under the Attorney General will appoint them.

Second—

I am still quoting from Representative HOBBS—

the district judges are up in arms over it because, due to the four-page set of regulations which govern the selection of probation officers, in effect, it takes the appointment power away from the judges and gives it to the Attorney General. The regulations call for certain qualifications, as work in the social sciences—

I digress long enough to say that in the case of a man convicted of a crime it is required that a probation officer must be qualified in the social sciences before he can tell whether or not that man ought to be placed on probation. I think—and I am sure my learned and distinguished friend from Arizona, for whom I have the greatest respect and esteem, will agree with me—that that sort of thing is poppycock.

Representative HOBBS further said:

The regulations call for certain qualifications, as work in the social sciences, college degrees, or other prerequisites which they feel are unnecessary.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona has the floor, and he has very kindly yielded to me, and I thank him.

Mr. ASHURST. I was glad to yield. I have been instructed, as I usually am, when the Senator speaks.

First, as to the college degree. A college degree is for those who need it.

I have presented a letter of the Department of Justice, as I believe that Department's views should be known. I shall be so bold as to suggest that this amendment be at least sent to conference:

*Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be used to defray the salary or expenses of any probation officer whose work fails to comply with the standards promulgated by the Attorney General, and no part may be used for the payment of compensation of new probation officers who do not have proper qualifications as prescribed by the conference of senior circuit judges.

The able Senator from Tennessee will be on the conference committee. I am willing, and I think the Department of Justice is willing, that the matter may be considered by the conference. I am quite prepared to trust to the sagacity and judgment and fairness of the Senator from Tennessee and the other conferees. If they are willing to adopt the amendment, very good.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me call the Senator's attention to the language stricken out on pages 46 and 47, the language the House adopted, which is even stronger than the amendment which has been suggested by the Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. Very true.

Mr. McKELLAR. So it will all go to conference anyway, and I shall certainly give close attention to what has been said.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Department of Justice could ask no more than to have their suggested amendment go to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment. As I understand, the Senator does not offer the amendment, but is willing that the matter go to conference on the House provision and the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. ASHURST. I would have to have the amendment adopted before it could go to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. The provision is already included in the House text.

Mr. ASHURST. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McKELLAR. All of it is included except as to the circuit judges. If the Senator wants to add that provision, I shall be very glad to accept it.

Mr. ASHURST. In order to be on the safe side, and to be certain that the conference will have jurisdiction, I should like to have the whole matter go to conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say in connection with this matter that as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary I served on a subcommittee which considered legislation proposing to do the very thing the Senator proposes in his amendment, and the subcommittee, after considerable discussion and study, rejected the measure then before it. I shall not oppose the wish of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that this matter go to conference, but the major considerations which influenced the subcommittee to which I have referred were that a probation officer is supposed to be an officer to advise the district judge as to whether he, the district judge, shall put someone on probation, and, after a person is on probation, whether or not he is behaving himself, and complying with the rules and requirements. But, like most departments here in Washington, the Bureau of Prisons—and I say this with respect—wants to say who shall be probation officers; it really wants to appoint probation officers, and the bill which the subcommittee considered was much more comprehensive than the proposed amendment. It proposed that the probation officers should all be appointed by the Attorney General; that he should appoint the probation officers to advise the district judges, regardless of whether or not the judges wanted them. Of course, this is just an approach. If they get this much, at the next session their demands will grow a little stronger. The subcommittee to which I have referred rejected the whole theory.

I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that if this question does go to conference, if anyone is to be consulted, it ought not to be the senior circuit judges. What does a senior circuit judge off in a room somewhere, who never sees a jury and never sees a man charged with crime, sitting off in a room with his nose in an old abstract of record, know about the kind of man who should be appointed probation officer? This merely means that the Department of Justice will tell the senior circuit judges what they want. Let me show how foolish the proposal contained in the House text is. This is a limitation, which is the method frequently used to legislate if otherwise the provision cannot be adopted.

Mr. McKELLAR. This in effect repeals the law now in force.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; but under the guise of a limitation, which, parliamentarily speaking, is in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. It provides:

*Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be used to defray the salary or expenses of any probation officer whose work fails to comply—

Not of a probation officer who fails to comply but whose work fails to comply—

fails to comply with the standards promulgated by the Attorney General.

In other words, if he recommends that someone be put on probation and it does not suit the Attorney General, then his work does not meet the standard set by the Attorney General.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment there?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That applies to all existing probation officers. If it turns out in the future that the work of one, although he may have been acceptable for 10 years, does not comply with the standard, he is out.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, when it says "Attorney General," it does not mean the Attorney General; it means someone under the Attorney General who is going to run this bureau. It is necessary to use the Attorney General as a front show window, but that does not mean the Attorney General; it means that some little functionary here in Washington is going to tell the district judge what kind of a man shall serve as probation officer. It will also permit some "two bit" functionary to say what shall be the grounds for placing one on probation, and what sort of conduct shall mean a forfeiture of probation. That is what it means.

I shall not oppose the amendment, because the chairman of my committee urges that the language go in the bill, but

I hope the Senator from Tennessee will use some judgment when he gets into conference and see that the House does not impose this provision on him.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. KING. We have in my State a judge on the Federal bench, the ablest one the State has ever had. He came from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I know he is all right.

Mr. KING. They have attempted for years to force upon him a probation officer. He says, "I will do the probation work myself," and he follows every person convicted and sentenced. He knows where those people are. They confer with him and he confers with them, and he has refused to permit these "two bit" officials, who have been referred to, to be appointed probation officers, because, he says, "I am responsible for these men, and I am looking after the work." If this amendment should be enacted, I think he would resign.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask the Senator from Utah a question. Let me suggest to him that trial judges now have authority to appoint clerks of courts, they have authority to appoint marshals if there are vacancies, and to appoint other officers of the courts. The Department will next want to say who shall be the clerks of the courts, and probably who shall be the marshals.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to a practical phase of the matter. We have stricken out the language of the House. If we were to adopt an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment, we would be confined to a choice between the Senator's amendment and the language of the House, and, if that were the case, either one would take the matter out of the hands of the district judge. So I feel that I will have to oppose the Senator's amendment, on that account.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senate adopted the substitute, the only difference between the two would be that the regulation would be prescribed, under the House language, by the Attorney General, and under the Senator's amendment by the circuit judges.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is all.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that in conference it would be necessary to take either regulation by the circuit judges or by the Attorney General. If the matter goes to conference with the House language stricken out, the whole field will be open, and it can be arranged in a satisfactory way.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator from Arizona will permit that to be done.

Mr. ASHURST. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let all the language be stricken out, and let us take it to conference.

Mr. ASHURST. Very well. I yield to the suggestion of the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish that nothing be done indirectly. What I seek—and I am really a conduit in the matter, conveying the view of the Department of Justice to the Senate—is that whatever may be done shall be done in the full light of day. I wish to have every Senator understand it. I desire particularly that the whole subject go to conference so that the conferees will not be limited in their jurisdiction.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senate committee amendment shall be adopted, that will put the whole matter in conference.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senate committee amendment shall be adopted, the provision that no part may be used for the payment of compensation of new probation officers who do not have proper qualifications as prescribed by the



Conference of Senior Circuit Judges would not be in conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; if the provision is stricken out entirely the whole subject matter will be in conference.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am content.

I will say one other word. It is quite interesting to note that among all Senators, the two Senators who are noted for the amplitude and grandeur of their speech are the two Senators who have referred to these officials as "two-bit" officials. They do not do that out of any poverty of language, because they are noted for their facility of language. I scarcely know what they mean when they say "two-bit" officials.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in deference to the Senator from Arizona, who scorns such plain, harsh terms, I withdraw the "two bits."

Mr. ASHURST. No; not that I scorn the term "two bit," Mr. President. It is interesting, however, to note that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], whose speeches are read in some of our public schools as models of excellence in the use of language, should have used such an epithet. That is what intrigues me.

Mr. President, I resume my seat on the assurance that the matter will go to conference.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) making an additional appropriation for the control of outbreaks of insect pests, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) making an additional appropriation for the control of outbreaks of insect pests was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### COTTON EXPORT SUBSIDY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to bring before the Senate a matter extraneous to the particular amendment now before the Senate or the appropriation bill.

First, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from a county agent in the State of Alabama, the photostatic copy of which I hold in my hand, and from which I wish to read. This letter is headed:

Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, State of Alabama. Marion, Ala., March 15, 1939.

It is addressed to—

DEAR FARMERS OF PERRY COUNTY: We will begin delivering 1938 agricultural conservation checks Friday of this week. Since 1933 farmers in Perry County have received \$1,532,780 in A. A. A. benefit payments. You will receive \$254,000 this year as cotton-reduction and soil-building payment and approximately \$200,000 as a parity payment. The total amount of money received from the Federal Government in benefit payments during the 6 years of A. A. A. amounts to the gross return for the total cotton production in Perry County for the last 3 years. There is only one way to continue to receive these payments; it is through the membership in an organization which is strong enough to tell Congress what you want. The American Farm Bureau Federation is the largest farm organization in the world, and only through this organization have you been able to receive these payments.

The letter then proceeds, Mr. President, with a detail of organization, and the farmer is advised that when a sufficient membership has been secured in the county, or in the beat or community, as it is called, that then a county- and State-wide organization will be perfected.

I now read further, Mr. President:

The annual dues in the Farm Bureau are \$2 per year; 75 cents is kept in the community and county treasury, 75 cents to the State organization, and 50 cents to the national organization. When you join this organization you receive a lapel emblem with the name of the American Farm Bureau on it, a State Alabama Farm Bureau News, which is a monthly newspaper giving you agricultural news of the State, and Nation's Agriculture, which is a magazine published by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Complimentary reference is made specifically to Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau

Federation, and the farmer is reminded that through this organization he has received the benefit payments recited in this letter.

I offer the full letter and wish it to appear as a part of my remarks. It is signed by R. L. Griffin, county agent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

#### COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF ALABAMA,

Marion, Ala., March 15, 1939.

DEAR FARMERS OF PERRY COUNTY: We will begin delivering 1938 agricultural conservation checks Friday of this week. Since 1933 farmers in Perry County have received \$1,532,780 in A. A. A. benefit payments. You will receive \$254,000 this year as cotton-reduction and soil-building payment and approximately \$200,000 as a parity payment. The total amount of money received from the Federal Government in benefit payments during the 6 years of A. A. A. amounts to the gross return for the total cotton production in Perry County for the last 3 years. There is only one way to continue to receive these payments—it is through the membership in an organization which is strong enough to tell Congress what you want. The American Farm Bureau Federation is the largest farm organization in the world, and only through this organization have you been able to receive these payments.

The old suit against the farm bureau organization in Perry County has been thrown out of equity court and the county is being organized in beat or community farm bureaus. When sufficient membership has been obtained in each beat or community the beat membership chairman will call a meeting to organize and elect officers for his beat or community. The presidents of these beat or community organizations will make up the county council or board of directors of the county organization. This plan has been outlined by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of American Farm Bureau Federation, and Mr. Howard Gray, president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation. These community or beat organizations not only are a definite part of a State and National organization, but have a definite service to render to each individual in the community. The strength and success of these organizations depend on what you do as an individual in an organized way for your community organization.

The annual dues in the Farm Bureau are \$2 per year. Seventy-five cents is kept in the community and county treasury, 75 cents to the State organization, and 50 cents to the national organization. When you join this organization you receive a lapel emblem with the name of the American Farm Bureau on it, a State Alabama Farm Bureau News, which is a monthly newspaper giving you agricultural news of the State, and Nation's Agriculture, which is a magazine published by the American Farm Bureau Federation. Should you subscribe to a paper or magazine of this type, the annual subscription would exceed \$2.

On delivering 1938 A. A. A. checks your beat membership committee will be on hand to give you an opportunity to join your community farm bureau. For each dollar you invest in farm-bureau dues you have received \$125 of this in Government benefit payments. I know of no better investment of insurance that you can make on your farm or in business today.

Let me urge you to willingly join this organization. Your \$2 Farm Bureau dues will earn you more than any investment you have ever made or probably ever will make in your lifetime.

Sincerely,

R. L. GRIFFIN, County Agent.

Mr. GEORGE. I call attention, Mr. President, to another letter. The caption of the other letter, which I also ask to have inserted in full in the RECORD, is as follows:

United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Agricultural conservation program. Greenville, Miss.

Mr. President, this letter reads as follows:

Farm Bureau—

In big capitals at the head of the letter.

The Farm Bureau has helped the farmer to get benefit payments for reducing his cotton crop, soil-building payments for improving his land, and parity payments such as you are receiving.

The membership fee is \$2—

In big capitals.

This \$2 gives to you the National Farm Bureau paper and the State Farm Bureau paper.

It helps to support the National Farm Bureau.

It helps to support the State and county Farm Bureau.

All are working together for better legislation for farmers.

Don't you think you ought to be a member of this organization and help pay for some of the benefits you secure? How to join the Farm Bureau.

And at the bottom of this letter, Mr. President, is a blank in which the farmer is to insert merely the name, the amount of

money, and is told where to mail it. This letter is likewise signed by a county agent, Mr. J. W. Whitaker.

I ask to have that letter printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,  
AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM,  
Greenville, Miss., November 15, 1938.  
FARM BUREAU

The Farm Bureau has helped the farmer to get benefit payments for reducing his cotton crop, soil-building payments for improving his land, and parity payments such as you are receiving.

The membership fee is \$2.

This \$2 gives to you the National Farm Bureau paper and the State farm bureau paper.

It helps to support the National Farm Bureau.

It helps to support the State and county farm bureau.

All are working together for better legislation for farmers.

Don't you think you should be a member of this organization and help pay for some of the benefits you secure?

#### HOW TO JOIN THE FARM BUREAU

Either pay \$2 in cash at the county agent's office or send us a check for this amount.

Don't forget to do this. I am sure that you want to do your part.

Yours very truly,

J. W. WHITAKER, County Agent.

#### IMPORTANT

Fill out the following and return with your letter so we can send you a receipt for the \$2:

-----, Miss, -----, 1938.  
-----  
(Name) (Address)  
Community in which you live -----

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LEE. Does the Senator know whether or not these letters were mailed out at Government expense?

Mr. GEORGE. My information is that they were.

Mr. LEE. The letter from which the Senator last read as well as the one from which he first read?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; as well as the one I first read.

Mr. President, the farm agent, of course, is under the Extension Service, but he is likewise the official secretary of the Department of Agriculture, to wit, the Triple A and the Soil Conservation Service in each county where a farm agent is maintained. His salary is, of course, paid jointly by the Federal Government and by the several counties in which he renders his service.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that quite recently in this body we had up for discussion the export subsidy on cotton. The discussion arose over an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Since that discussion the Secretary of Agriculture has made a speech at Little Rock, Ark., and Mr. Edward O'Neal, the president of the Farm Bureau, has made speeches within my State, the sole purpose of which was to perfect an organization of the Farm Bureau and to secure an endorsement of the export subsidy on unmanufactured cotton. The Secretary of Agriculture was delighted in going on record with the statement that he proposed, notwithstanding the action taken in the Senate, to exercise his authority under existing law, and to put in effect a subsidy. That, Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that it is earnestly and sincerely combatted by most respectable men in the cotton industry from top to bottom.

Mr. Wallace imagines that he and his organization in the Department have more judgment and are better able to handle a world product like cotton than the entire cotton trade in the United States, from the farmer who produces cotton up to the last man who handles it.

So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to farmers joining the Farm Bureau. I certainly have no objection to a farmer joining any organization which he may wish to join. However, I take the position that the Department of Agriculture or the administration has no justification whatsoever for sending out letters of this character through county agents, who are the official representatives of the

Secretary of Agriculture himself in his capacity as administrator of the Soil Conservation Act and in his capacity as Administrator of the A. A. A. In fact, the county agent is the head and front of the whole Agricultural Department in every county in which his services are utilized.

Mr. President, think for a moment what these letters mean. The first letter begins by a recitation of the benefit payments which had been received by the farmers in the county of Perry, in the good State of Alabama. It recites that during the 6 years of the A. A. A. the farmers in that county had received total benefits equal to the combined value of the last three crops of cotton grown in that county. The letter reminds the farmer that—

We will begin delivering 1938 agricultural conservation checks Friday of this week—

That is, the week of March 15, 1939. Then it proceeds:

There is only one way to continue to receive these payments. It is through membership in an organization which is strong enough to tell Congress what you want. The American Farm Bureau Federation is the largest farm organization in the world, and only through this organization have you been able to receive these payments.

It must indeed be news to Senators that they have been driven only through the American Farm Bureau Federation by Edward O'Neal, who is merely a "shirt front" for Mr. Earl Smith, of Chicago, the head of the organization and a very able man.

Mr. President, I have received other information that throughout the South letters of this kind are being mailed out by county agents under frank. I know that since the Secretary delivered his speech at Little Rock, and since the fight in the Senate over the question of the subsidy on cotton exports, Edward O'Neal has been within my State appealing for the support of a subsidy.

I do not fear the Secretary of Agriculture, and I do not cringe or bend the knee to any man in official position in this administration. For that reason I do not hesitate to say that the campaign now being carried on in my State is being carried on only because some of us here have an independent judgment and are willing to undertake to represent all the people of our States. I know very well that it is quite easy to mislead the farmers for a while, even in my State, but I have no doubt that their good judgment will repudiate tactics of this kind when they understand what it all means. If the Department of Agriculture is organizing farmers for political reasons, why single out the American Farm Bureau Federation? Why single out the organization whose leaders have stood against a fair break to southern farmers when they desired to grow upon the lands taken out of cotton production food and feed crops for the production of livestock, dairy products, and poultry and poultry products?

Why discriminate against the National Grange? I hold no brief for the National Grange, but it is certainly an honorable farm organization. I believe it is the oldest farm organization in the country. Certainly it is one of the soundest. Why discriminate against the Farmers' Union? The Farmers' Union had 10 members to 1 of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and it will retain a record of more than 10 members to every 1 of the American Farm Bureau Federation so far as Georgia is concerned. Mr. President, some good farmers in Georgia are members of the American Farm Bureau Federation. However, they are not entitled to have a department of this Government, a department dealing intimately with the farmers of America, undertake to build up a particular farm organization and to use it when any Member of Congress has the courage to have an independent judgment and to express it.

Not so long ago, Mr. President, a distinguished lawyer from my own State, on the eve of the retirement of another attorney in one of the Federal agencies, namely, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, wrote a letter commending the retiring attorney, highly recommending his legal ability, and giving the office number of his future office in the city of Washington. The writer of that letter was driven out of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Yet there is a county agent who boasts that the total benefits paid for 6 years to the



farmers of one good county in one good State had exceeded the combined market value of all the cotton grown by those farmers for the past 3 years, making an appeal to them to become members of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and telling them what it costs. There is not a line of official business in the first letter which I read, save the first line:

We will begin delivering 1938 agricultural conservation checks Friday of this week.

That was only preliminary to the appeal for membership in the American Farm Bureau Federation.

In the second letter which I put into the RECORD there is not a single line of official business.

What is the Post Office Department doing? Why drive out the attorney of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation because he commended a retiring attorney, and then allow letters of this kind to be broadcast over the South and over the country?

I do not make any attack on the American Farm Bureau Federation; but I say here and now—and I will say it on every stump in Georgia—that the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation is not Edward O'Neal, of Alabama, who is merely a stuffed front for that organization. The head of the organization is Earl Smith, of Chicago; and Earl Smith's interest is the protection of farmers who do not grow cotton.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is a good farm organization. I have no fight to make on it; but I have a fight to make on any man who will lend himself to a Federal agency in an effort to suppress free thought and free speech, or an effort to intimidate Members of Congress, either in the Senate or the House, when they feel it necessary to speak plainly upon any policy or program of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I have no concern about what organization the farmers unite themselves with, whether it be the Grange or the Farmers' Union or the United Farmers of Georgia or the Farm Bureau Federation itself; but I do think that the farmers of the State ought to know, and, insofar as I am able to make it known to them they will know, the real purpose of Mr. O'Neal in going into the State within the last few days.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Georgia a question in reference to the first letter he read?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. Am I correct in understanding that letter to say that the federation was the real cause of them getting these benefits?

Mr. GEORGE. I will read it to the Senator. After enumerating the benefits the letter says:

There is only one way to continue to receive these payments; it is through the membership in an organization which is strong enough to tell Congress what you want. The American Farm Bureau Federation is the largest farm organization in the world and only through this organization have you been able to receive those payments.

Mr. SMITH. I thought I so understood the letter. I am a little surprised at that statement for it has been my impression that we in Congress had a little something to do with it. I may have been mistaken. I am not a member of that Federation, and have no desire to be. Knowing the reputation of its officers, I prefer not to be. The letter, however, confirms my judgment on that matter. I think it was a pretty bold statement to be franked to thousands of farmers under the auspices of our Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GEORGE. And, I may add, or to be written over the signature of an official of the United States Government.

Mr. President, with reference to the subsidy, I do not today propose to discuss it, but I do propose to discuss it hereafter. I ask permission to have inserted in the body of my remarks, and as a part thereof, an editorial from the Atlanta Constitution of May 11, 1939, on The Cotton Export Subsidy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of May 11, 1939]

#### COTTON EXPORT SUBSIDY

The problems of cotton are so varied and complicated that it is to be doubted if there lives the man who comprehensively understands them all. Add to this the fact that it is a matter of practical impossibility to find any so-called expert whose views are not open to bias, suspicion, and it is little wonder that Congress flounders around in a succession of futile attempts to find a panacea.

The latest proposal, to grant an export subsidy of 2 cents per pound, with the announced purpose of revitalizing exports and thus relieving the burden of carry-over on the domestic market, seems to be, however, among the more unwise remedial endeavors.

For it should be plain that payment of a 2-cents-a-pound subsidy to cotton exporters can result only in providing the foreign textile manufacturer with cheaper cotton than his American competitor can buy. The 2-cents-a-pound payments will not go to the cotton farmer, but by the simple process of market balancings will inevitably make American cotton sold abroad just that much cheaper. Already, in anticipation of possible enactment of this scheme by the United States Congress, Liverpool cotton quotations are dropping further than normal below those of the United States cotton exchanges.

The foreign manufacturer already enjoys the advantage of lower-cost labor, and if he gets this added advantage in the price of his raw material it can easily be imagined what will happen to the American textile markets, where foreign-made goods must compete with the products of our own mills.

Then, probably, there will be demands for an increased tariff against foreign textiles, once again building up that complication of charges and subsidies and offsets which is actually responsible for much of cotton's woes today.

It all goes back to the basic injustice—that the cotton farmer must sell on an unprotected world market and buy on a tariff-protected market at home.

The keenest minds in the country have attempted in vain to adequately improve the situation of the cotton farmer. There can be, therefore, no proper attempt to point such a way here.

But from any angle it seems self-evident that the American cotton interests, from producers to consumers, can expect no benefit out of a scheme to use American money to bribe foreign purchasers to buy more of our products. It just doesn't make sound logic.

Mr. GEORGE. I also ask to have inserted in the body of my remarks an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of May 28, 1939, entitled "Cotton Quotas." I read but the first sentence:

Having worked itself into a dangerous position on cotton, the administration is now hoping to get foreign nations to help it pull its chestnuts out of the fire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

[From Baltimore Sun of May 28, 1939]

#### COTTON QUOTAS

Having worked itself into a dangerous position on cotton, the administration is now hoping to get foreign nations to help it pull its chestnuts out of the fire. This country has been steadily and rapidly losing its export markets as a result of crop control and price jugglery. Things have got so bad that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture are trying to put over a cotton export subsidy to enable us to work off some of the surplus accumulations now held under Government loan. But the subsidy scheme looks so bad and runs so directly counter to the reciprocal-trade program to which the administration has committed itself through Secretary Hull that it is regarded as a mere make-shift.

As a permanent solution for the problem created by dwindling export markets, the administration now wishes to hold an international cotton conference. The idea is that the producing nations represented at the conference would agree upon a division of the world markets and set up a quota system which would terminate the present competition among sellers and assure every nation, including our own, a fixed share of the world cotton trade. This is not the first time such an idea has been put forward. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration sent Oscar Johnston abroad to sound out other nations on this same subject in 1935, but he met with such an unfavorable response that the scheme for international cotton quotas was abandoned.

The trouble then was that other nations were unwilling to give up the advantages they had already reaped and the advantages which were in prospect as a result of our restrictive program. They saw quite clearly that the production-control and price-rigging features of the A. A. A. were making it easy for growers in India, Uganda, Brazil, and all points east to undersell us in the world markets, and they decided to sit back and let the American cotton industry go on committing economic suicide. Whether the present conference project will get any further than the enterprise upon which Mr. Johnston was sent abroad remains to be seen. But if it does it will probably be because we are

more willing than we were in 1935 to offer political and other concessions in return for help in getting out of the cotton mess.

As to the merits of the international-quota scheme, it may at least be said that it recognizes the international character of the cotton problem. That is more than can be said for the short-sighted and costly policy we have been following to our disadvantage for the past 6 years. But international quotas, like domestic quotas, represent an arbitrary interference with the free movement of prices and commodities upon which a sound and prosperous cotton market must in the last analysis depend. It is a strange and contradictory situation in which an administration which is seeking by means of reciprocal treaties to unshackle trade should be seriously proposing on another front to shackle it again.

Mr. GEORGE. And, Mr. President, in order to bring the matter down to date—and I am not undertaking to offer all the editorials that I have of like import—I desire to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post, June 12, 1939, entitled "A Clash of Policies," in which the subsidy is likewise under attack.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 12, 1939]

#### A CLASH OF POLICIES

During the first 10 months of the current fiscal year the Department of Agriculture reports a drop of 21 percent in the value of our agricultural exports. This decline is largely attributable to a shrinkage of cotton exports which are expected to be smaller this season than at any time during the past half century.

Since 1933, when the administration embarked upon its price-raising campaign, American cotton has been rapidly losing ground abroad. When efforts to raise prices by means of acreage control failed, Government loans were resorted to as a means of keeping domestic cotton prices above world market levels. As a result, cheaper cotton of foreign growths has been steadily pushing the American product out of its former export markets.

The curtailment of our export trade in cotton is patently due to a price-control policy that has aggravated the existing disproportion between demand and supply. The only feasible method of recapturing a substantial part of this trade is to abandon the practices that are responsible for our difficulties. Unfortunately, neither Congress nor the administration is prepared to withdraw the props that prevent shippers of cotton and other products from meeting the prices charged for competing foreign products.

Instead of removing the artificial hindrances to correction of existing economic maladjustments, new forms of interference with prices and normal marketing processes are being considered. The President and Secretary Wallace, for instance, recommend payment of export bounties as a means of pushing a portion of our abnormally large cotton surplus into export channels. Export subsidies have already been applied to wheat. If we should extend the system to cotton, the pressure to obtain subsidies for still other agricultural commodities would steadily increase.

From the national viewpoint the subsidization of exports is most uneconomic and, from the taxpayers' viewpoint, very costly. Moreover, even if we were disposed to disregard the purely economic arguments against subsidized exporting, we could not close our eyes to certain practical objections to this system. The United States takes prompt steps to protect domestic producers from the competition of dumped imports. Why, then, should we expect foreigners to submit passively to the dumping of our agricultural products into their markets?

Export subsidies are not only economically indefensible; they are also in conflict with the policies being followed by the Department of State in negotiating reciprocal-trade pacts. There is an irreconcilable inconsistency between the Hull efforts to lower trade barriers and the A. A. A.'s price-raising program, which inevitably leads to the erection of new barriers to international trade. We are simply deceiving ourselves by pretending that we can expand our foreign trade by mutual agreement and simultaneously pursue price-raising policies that seriously impair or actually destroy the demand for our exports.

Mr. GEORGE. Now, Mr. President, I wish to put into the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter from a gentleman who lives in Georgia who calls attention to what the Secretary of Agriculture did not say in his address at Little Rock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

ATLANTA, GA., May 27, 1939.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Referring to United States Secretary of Agriculture Wallace's speech at Little Rock on May 26.

I would like to make the following observations for your consideration which I do not think have been brought out in connection with Secretary Wallace's speech:

1. Why did not Secretary Wallace tell the farmers, in his speech referred to above, that under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which is quoted below, he has the authority, without

further legislation, to pay, assuming the agricultural appropriations bill is passed as now written, \$50,000,000, or approximately \$8.30 per bale on a 6,000,000-bale domestic consumption, to the cotton producers direct, supplementing other payments, but prefers to pay this \$50,000,000 as an export subsidy, thereby giving cheaper cotton to the foreign cotton manufacturer to manufacture into cotton goods from American cotton for sale to foreign consumers?

Section 32 of Agricultural Adjustment Act: "Such sums shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture only to (1) encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof by the payment of benefits in connection with the exportation thereof or of indemnities for losses incurred in connection with such exportation or by payments to producers in connection with the production of that part of any agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption; (2) encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means, from the normal channels of trade and commerce; and (3) finance adjustments in the quantity planted or produced for market of agricultural commodities. The amount appropriated under this section shall be expended for such of the above-specified purposes, and at such times, and in such manner, and in such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture finds will tend to increase the exportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof, and increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities and products thereof: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated by this section shall be expended pursuant to clause (3) hereof unless the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the expenditure of such part pursuant to clauses (1) and (2) is not necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section."

2. Why did not Secretary Wallace, in referring to how much cotton would be exported under the export subsidy plan, tell them that the price of foreign cotton would decline 2 cents per pound under the domestic prices in the United States as evidenced by the following quotation from the Cotton Situation, published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, under date of April 29, 1939:

"Since the middle of March, the Liverpool price of American Middling  $\frac{3}{8}$  has declined materially in relation to the prices of this cotton in domestic markets. On March 17 the spread between the Liverpool prices and the 10-market average price was 1.62 cents per pound, but by April 24 this spread had narrowed to 0.71 cents. This was apparently due to the increased possibility of an export subsidy on American cotton, which would be expected eventually to reduce the foreign price in relation to the domestic price by about the full amount of the subsidy, such change taking the form of a reduction in the foreign price and an increase in the domestic price, compared with what they otherwise would be. On April 27 the spread was back to 0.95 cents."

3. Why did not Secretary Wallace tell the American consumers of cotton goods that his export subsidy plan would mean furnishing American cotton to foreign manufacturers to manufacture into cotton goods for the foreign consumer at 2 cents per pound or \$10 per bale under the price paid by the American cotton manufacturer to manufacture into cotton goods to be consumed by the American public? This being a hidden sales tax on the American consumer.

4. Why did not Secretary Wallace tell the American consumers of cotton goods of his advocacy of a processing tax on raw cotton, assuming he had in mind 4.2 cents per pound tax as previously, that he was furnishing American cotton to foreign cotton manufacturers for manufacture into cotton goods for the foreign consumers at 4.2 cents per pound, or \$21 per bale, further under the same prices of cotton to American manufacturers for manufacture into cotton goods for the American consumer? This also being a hidden sales tax.

5. Why did not Secretary Wallace tell the American consumers of cotton goods that this would mean the foreign manufacturer would be obtaining American cotton to manufacture into cotton goods for the foreign consumers at a total of \$31 per bale under the price which would be paid by the American manufacturer to manufacture into cotton goods for sale to the American consumer? This being a total of 6.2 cents per pound sales tax on the American consumer.

6. Why did he not tell his audience, when he referred to further reduction in acreage increasing unemployed farm labor, that this has been brought to his attention time and again by the cotton merchants and is not his original thought?

I believe the above points should be brought out by someone like you to whom the press would give Nation-wide comment.

Respectfully yours,

J. M. GLOER, Jr., Secretary.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, with this one final observation, I will take my seat, but I promise to resume this discussion, and to continue it until something is done to prevent the continuance of this kind of thing under this administration. The audience that listened to the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture at Little Rock, estimated at some 3,000 people, was largely made up of employees of the Agricultural Department, county agents, county committees, and various other officials, including all those who, under the Farm Security Administration, are occupying farms provided in whole



or in part by the Government. I shall have some information to give with reference to that meeting; I shall have some information to give to the Senate and to the country with reference to how this audience of 3,000 was gotten together; and I think, Mr. President, I will also have some verification of the statement that Mr. Edward O'Neal, the president of the Farm Bureau Federation, in behalf of which these appointed agents in more than one State are now busily propagandizing, was in the midst of the audience at Little Rock to hear the Secretary.

I have no quarrel with the Secretary because he believes in a subsidy; it is a matter on which men may differ. I repeat, however, that the cotton trade and very nearly everyone connected with it who stands in a disinterested position is against it. Nevertheless, I have no quarrel to make because the Secretary of Agriculture advocates such a policy or because he may ultimately put it into effect. I know that when he puts it into effect he will have taken the final step looking to the destruction of the foreign market and the partial impairment even of the domestic market, for reasons which I tried to point out in this body some days ago.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture cannot justify the action of an official whose salary is paid always to the extent of one-half, and in many instances to the extent of more than one-half, by the Federal Government, and who represents not merely the Extension Service—a vital service to agriculture—but who is likewise the official representative of the Soil Conservation Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in the several counties in which his services are utilized.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat? I am sorry I did not hear the entire statement of the able Senator from Georgia.

As I came into the Chamber, during the latter part of his address, I understood him to say that the Department was engaged in this activity of furthering the cause of the Farm Bureau Federation. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. I read, if the Senator will permit me, from two letters signed by farm agents—county agents. I stated that these county agents represent not merely the Extension Service, which is a vital service to agriculture, but they likewise are the official representatives of the Soil Conservation Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Mr. MINTON. What the Senator put in the RECORD, then, were communications from two different agents. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. From two different agents.

Mr. MINTON. Were they in two different States or both in the Senator's State?

Mr. GEORGE. They were in two different States.

Mr. MINTON. Is it the Senator's position that this is a program that is being carried out by the Department itself?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think I have made myself abundantly clear on the question involved.

Mr. MINTON. I am sorry I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. I stated just exactly what has been done and what is being done, and I have stated that the president of the Farm Bureau Federation, who in both letters is referred to, in one by name and the other by his organization, has been in my State in the last week holding meetings of farmers and importuning those farmers to petition Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to support the subsidy program of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MINTON. Of course, I think we will all agree with the Senator that if the Department or any substantial group in the Department is engaged in any activity of the kind indicated by the Senator they are subject to the condemnation which the Senator brings upon them for it. But what I am trying to get at is whether or not this was the program of the Department; whether the Department was countenancing it, or whether a couple of overzealous agents in the Senator's State or some other State were acting upon their own initiative to do that of which the Senator complains.

Mr. GEORGE. I cannot speak of the county agents disparagingly. My observation has been that they are very

good men and that they do not indulge in this kind of thing ordinarily. I do not know what is moving some of them at this time, but I merely recited the facts and put them in the RECORD. The Senator can, by looking at my remarks, see exactly what I have said.

Mr. MINTON. The Senator has not any evidence that the Department moved them to take this action, has he?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would rather the Senator would read my remarks. Perhaps he will be able to understand from my remarks what I have said.

#### ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR CONTROL OF INSECT PESTS

Mr. RUSSELL. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably without amendment House Joint Resolution 322, making an additional appropriation for the control of outbreaks of insect pests. I ask that the joint resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) making an additional appropriation for the control of outbreaks of insect pests was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That for an additional amount, fiscal year 1939, for carrying out the purposes of and for expenditures authorized under, Public Resolution No. 91, Seventy-fifth Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution making funds available for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases, including grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs,' approved April 6, 1937," approved May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 344), there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,750,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until December 31, 1939.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the current agricultural appropriation bill there is a provision making an appropriation of this amount for the same purpose. The provision in the House joint resolution makes the amount immediately available. Due to the fact that it doubtless will be some time before the agricultural appropriation bill has completed the steps necessary to enact it into law, it is important that this joint resolution be passed today. I understand that the grasshopper situation is more critical than it has been in recent years, and all funds for dealing with that situation will be exhausted today.

The joint resolution does not involve any increased appropriation, because the same amount was appropriated by the Senate in the agricultural appropriation bill; and, of course, that amendment will be left out of the bill when the conference report is submitted. The joint resolution merely makes the funds immediately available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6392) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 46, beginning in line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Judicial—Court of Customs and Patent Appeals", on page 50, line 9, after the word "court", to strike out "\$104,300" and insert "\$105,780", so as to read:

Salaries: Presiding judge and four associate judges and all other officers and employees of the court, \$105,780.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Court of Claims", on page 51, line 11, before the word "regular", to strike out "six" and insert "seven", and in line 21, after the numerals "270" and the parenthesis, to strike out "\$65,000" and insert "\$75,500", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses of commissioners: For salaries of seven regular commissioners, and for traveling expenses, compensation of stenographers authorized by the court, and for stenographic and other fees and charges necessary in the taking of testimony and in the performance of the duties as authorized by the act entitled "An act amending section 2 and repealing section 3 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (28 U. S. C. 269, 270), entitled 'An act to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation', and for other purposes", approved June 23, 1930 (28 U. S. C. 270), \$75,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries of judges", on page 54, line 2, after the word "offices", to strike out "\$2,308,000" and insert "\$2,338,000", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses, clerks of courts: For salaries of clerks of United States circuit courts of appeals and United States district courts, their deputies, and other assistants, and expenses of conducting their respective offices, \$2,338,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 23, after the word "for", to strike out "\$856,000" and insert "\$940,000"; and on page 56, line 2, after the word "employed", to strike out the colon and the following provisos: "Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not be held to apply to the employment of a person possessing the dual qualifications of a stenographer and a licensed attorney who acts as a stenographer-law clerk, but the maximum salary of any such person so employed shall not exceed \$3,600 per annum: *Provided further*, That the salary of not more than one employee for any one district judge shall be paid from this appropriation", so as to read:

Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, \$940,000: *Provided*, That the maximum salary paid to any stenographer or law clerk to any circuit or district judge shall not exceed \$2,500 per annum, but this limitation shall not operate to reduce the compensation of any stenographer now employed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce, office of the Secretary", on page 58, line 9, after the name "Secretary of Commerce", to insert a comma and "Under Secretary of Commerce, \$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 17, after the word "Department", to strike out "\$381,500" and insert "\$606,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$133,500 of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary of Commerce for personal services of experts and specialists at rates of compensation not in excess of \$9,000 per annum without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided further*, That any person paid from the said \$133,500 an annual salary of \$5,000 or more shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] regarding this enormous increase in personnel for the office of Secretary Hopkins. The Senate seems to think about twice as much of Mr. Hopkins as the House does, according to the figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, without dealing in personalities, I will tell the Senator what this increase is for.

The Secretary of Commerce appeared before the committee, and asked for an appropriation of \$225,000 in addition to the amount already appropriated for the purpose of employing expert businessmen.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Had he asked for this appropriation in the House, and had it been denied, or was this a new request?

Mr. McKELLAR. This request came in after the bill had passed the House. There was a Budget estimate for it. The

Secretary proposed, out of this appropriation, to appoint and utilize the services of a number of expert businessmen in order to bring about better business conditions in the country. His testimony on that subject is very elaborate. It is found in the hearings. The personnel he desired was five at \$9,000, five at \$7,500, five at \$5,600, five at \$4,600, and others at smaller compensations, amounting in all to \$225,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How many new employees, all told, would there be?

Mr. McKELLAR. About 59.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I notice that all of them are to be chosen without regard to civil-service laws and regulations, or anything of the kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct; but all the higher-paid ones, all those except the detail men and clerks, are to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is it that they are going to do?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will explain the matter by reading part of the statement of the Secretary:

At present there is no provision for an executive staff to participate with the Secretary in an appraisal of larger problems that affect the commerce and industry of the country, or in maintaining contact with various agencies of the Government that deal with particular phases of the national problem, or for developing and carrying through any new constructive work. New work, new activities, and new problems are constantly being pressed upon the Department. Proposals flood in from all over the country. Some have merit, others do not, but all must be analyzed and weighed by someone of experience and ability. If we are to develop new constructive functions in the Department that will really aid and promote industrial activity and private employment, we require funds to provide a staff to do that work.

That, in a nutshell, is the reason for this proposal, the amount being \$225,000; and all of us want to make business conditions better in the country.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Did not the Department have an advisory council of big, able businessmen upon whom it relied for this sort of work, and did it not obtain their services for nothing?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not think the Department got anything for nothing. It so happens that I have been connected with the Government now for, I think, 29 years. In all that time I do not know any employee of the Government, big or little, who has ever done any work for nothing. Some of them may have claimed to do something for nothing at some time, but before the work was over the Government had to pay, and, in my judgment, the Government ought to pay for services that are rendered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator condemning all the dollar-a-year men who have served the Government in past years?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not condemning anybody.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thought the Senator was doing so.

Mr. McKELLAR. But I want to say that I do not think any very great good was ever done by any dollar-a-year men. I make that statement very generally. I will say to the Senator that I was here when we had a very great many dollar-a-year men, and I never saw any good that any of them did.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, these are very laudable objectives.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so. The committee thought so. If there was any objection to this amendment, I do not recall it. It has been several days since we took this testimony, and there may have been some objection; but my recollection is that the proposal was very highly thought of by the members of the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In fact, this is \$225,000 worth of about as optimistic language as I have seen in some time.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has read the statement of Mr. Hopkins about the matter, has he?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I am trying to find out from the Senator from Tennessee what he proposes to do. This is purely a statement of generalities.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and I imagine that this work can be done only in that way. I do not know how else it can be done. The Secretary expects to appoint men who are in



business. The example given was that of Mr. Noble, who is now with the Department. It is desired to appoint men of that character and standing who would aid in reviving business along general lines; and necessarily the provision has to be general. We may either go into it or we need not go into it. In my own judgment, I think we ought to go into it. The Senator from Michigan may differ with me. If he does, I have no quarrel with him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. Noble is the Under Secretary of Commerce, and he is specifically provided for—

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; his salary does not come out of this appropriation at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. He is provided for on this anonymous staff.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would not call it an anonymous staff. It is provided in the bill that this staff is to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and I do not believe it could be called an anonymous staff. That is merely my judgment about it; the Senator may differ with me.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us see how specific it is. The first thing we buy with this \$225,000 is "a highly qualified executive staff." Does that mean that we have not one now?

Mr. McKELLAR. It means we have not one now. It is specifically so stated. We have not in the Department of Commerce at this time such a staff as is proposed, and this provision is inserted so that one may be set up.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The first thing we are to get is an appraisal "of the larger problems that affect the commerce and industry of the country." We are going to get a larger appraisal. That is worth something.

Mr. McKELLAR. I imagine that before any work is done it would be better to have some appraisal of conditions and some planning. My idea is that a man gets further in this world and I imagine a government gets further by first making plans and then working out the plans and living up to them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that is true. I notice they are going to assist the Congress in drafting legislation. Is that one of the functions?

Mr. McKELLAR. Nothing was said about that, so far as I recall. It might have been suggested, but I do not see how that could be done, except by giving Congress advice.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am merely reading the Senator's report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I overstepped myself if I put that in the report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Could we take a couple of thousand dollars off this appropriation to compensate for that overstepping?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; but the Senator can strike the statement out of the report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us see what else we are going to do. We are going to maintain "contact with various agencies of the Government dealing with particular phases of the national problem having a bearing on affairs of industry." Then we are going to develop and carry through "new constructive work, that will be welcomed by businessmen, directed toward improvement of business conditions at the earliest possible moment." I agree with the Senator that that is a laudable objective, but I submit to the Senator that that is the most nebulous basis for the justification of a new expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars that he has confronted in all the long years he was telling about that he has been in the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; we have had several more nebulous than that. I could recall dozens of them to the Senator's mind.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If they were any more nebulous, the Senator from Tennessee was opposing them, I am sure.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not so sure about that. I voted for some that I was very sorry afterward I voted for.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am trying to save the Senator from that calamity now.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Tennessee does not need saving; he will look after that himself.

Mr. President, I wish now to read what Mr. Hopkins says about the matter:

The provision that has heretofore been made for the Office of the Secretary seems to furnish adequate facilities for dealing with the administrative problems of the bureaus and to make effective the Secretary's policies with respect to their action and expenditure. The continuance of the routine work and normal operation of the Department is assured. The various bureaus are doing a splendid job, each in its respective field. One has only to look into the work that is done in charting the country's waterways, in lighting the channels of commerce, in the testing of materials and establishing standards for industry—

By the way, that sounds like nebulous language, but, quite the contrary, we know that those statements are absolutely correct—

in fact finding on business and commerce, to realize what an important contribution the work of the Department is making to our national economy.

However, even my short experience in the Department has convinced me that the activities of these bureaus can touch only a fraction of the problems of industry. Their work needs to be sparked by a driving force of policy. It is the lack of any organization for forming and carrying through broad vital policies that now most concerns me. I recognize in this my responsibility as Secretary and I willingly assume it. I want to do something more than administer a group of bureaus, important as they may be. I hope to be able to convert the results of the operations of these bureaus into aggressive affirmative policies that will promote and develop the whole body of our industry and commerce.

No one will question that it is in the national interest for the Department of Commerce to become a living and active force in building up industry and trade. Facts and figures are gathered at great expense and it is time for more extensive use to be made of them. They should be analyzed in the light of a full knowledge of the activities and experiences of various other agencies of the Government which deal with particular phases of the industrial problem. Information, analysis, experience should now all unite to develop an affirmative program of action toward national well-being.

At present there is no provision for an executive staff to participate with the Secretary in an appraisal of larger problems that affect the commerce and industry of the country, or in maintaining contact with various agencies of the Government that deal with particular phases of the national problem, or for developing and carrying through any new constructive work. New work, new activities, and new problems are constantly being pressed upon the Department. Proposals flood in from all over the country. Some have merit, others do not, but all must be analyzed and weighed by someone of experience and ability. If we are to develop new constructive functions in the Department that will really aid and promote industrial activity and private employment, we require funds to provide a staff to do that work.

As a matter of organization these additions could properly be made in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, whose functions are related to all of these problems. I am sure, however, it would be much better to have this staff working directly with the office of the Secretary.

I have no precedents to guide me in this matter of organization. It would clearly be unwise to attempt to set up at the present time a definite plan of men and methods for policy-making and accomplishment. I am, therefore, asking for a lump-sum appropriation of \$225,000, to create a staff to do this work in the office of the Secretary. Later, as experience accumulates, it should be possible to define particular positions and duties with some degree of certainty. On the other hand, it may always be desirable to allow the Secretary substantial opportunity for the exercise of initiative and discretion in the selection of associates required to help formulate and execute major questions of policy.

Mr. President, we all realize that the Department of Commerce should be utilized for the purpose of restoring better business conditions in the country. This is not a large appropriation as governmental appropriations go; but it is a very necessary one, made necessary by conditions which have confronted us for some time and which still confront us. It has been thought out by the Director of the Budget, and he has sent in an estimate for the appropriation. As I recall—and if there are any members of the committee who are opposed to this item I should like to have them say so—all the members of the committee who were present and who acted upon the proposal agreed to it. I hope very much the Senate will agree to it, because I believe it will be very helpful to business in our country.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator explain to me why the Secretary did not appear before the House committee in this connection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It was because he had been ill for quite a while, and when he appeared before our committee he was evidently still suffering from the illness.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have the greatest respect for the attitude of the able Senator from Tennessee, but I must confess that I still find myself completely baffled in consulting a paragraph of general language presumed to be relied upon as the sole reason for giving a new Secretary of Commerce 50 or 60 new administrative heads, the salaries running as high as \$9,000 a year, to be chosen without respect to the merit system or any of the restrictions which ordinarily surround appointments. I do not think it can be justified on the basis of this rather optimistic apostrophe in the Senator's report. I think when we are asked to increase to this enormous extent per capita the number of employees, when we are asked to expand a department in this fashion, we ought to be told precisely what is to be done, precisely why it is necessary and precisely why we have never heard about it heretofore.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think we could be as precise as the Senator from Michigan asks, but so far as the employees are concerned the first 20 are to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and all the others are to be civil-service employees.

Mr. VANDENBERG. When the 20 are appointed, are they to be appointed to specific assignments or is this a basket clause?

Mr. McKELLAR. They are to be appointed as expert business representatives in the Department of Commerce on the staff of the Secretary.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is that the designation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know the exact wording of the designation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. "John Doe, expert business representative, \$9,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be substantially what would be done.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I maintain my attitude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 58, line 9.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I associate myself with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in his opposition to the provisions of the bill under consideration. In my opinion, the facts do not justify favorable action upon the item now under consideration. In my opinion, the appropriations which have been made for the Department of Commerce, extending over a number of years, have been more than generous; indeed, in some particulars they have been excessive. A few moments ago I called attention to the large appropriations which had been made in behalf of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. As I indicated in my remarks, I was opposed to the creation of this Bureau, believing that the Department of State was better equipped to promote foreign trade and commerce than the Department of Commerce or any bureau that it might establish. It is unnecessary to state that our Government in its foreign relations operates through and by means of the Department of State. That Department and its officials have a prestige denied to other departments of the Government. The Department of State has its diplomatic representatives and consular agents in substantially all countries, and these representatives of the Department of State for many years have been active and effective agents in advancing our commerce in all foreign countries.

The Department of Commerce was developed from a small organization into one of very large proportions. Whether its achievements have been commensurate with its growth and its expenditures I hesitate to state, although it will be conceded by all that its activities by and large have been of benefit to our country. I do know, however, that our industrial and economic development has been greatly influenced by our foreign trade. A few years ago our total foreign trade amounted to between twelve and thirteen billions of dollars, and I might add in passing that while the Department of Commerce made some contribution to this great tide of trade and commerce, its activities were not of paramount consideration. A considerable portion of our exports consisted of agricultural products. Unfortunately tariff restric-

tions and, in my opinion, unsound legislation, have materially injured both our export and import trade and, of course, a reduction in the volume of foreign trade and commerce resulted in serious repercussions upon our domestic economy; indeed our internal trade and commerce bear a very close relationship to our foreign trade. The prosperity of our country has a close relationship to foreign trade and it is therefore important that every legitimate and proper means should be employed to find foreign markets for the products of our country. Other nations need many of our products and their material advancement would be enhanced if more of our domestic products reached their shores.

It is unnecessary to emphasize the importance of trade and commerce. It is obvious to all that a renaissance in business depends upon increased production and consumption and in finding markets for our surplus commodities in various parts of the world. We do not want barriers to prevent foreign trade and commerce or to interfere with domestic trade and commerce. We need bridges rather than barriers to carry the products of field, farm, factory, and mines to the people of the United States as well as to the people beyond the seas. An active and efficient Department of Commerce will be an important aid in stimulating trade and commerce.

I have been somewhat familiar with the work of the Department of Commerce during the past 25 years. I believe that it has been a factor in our industrial and economic development and I shall be glad to support any reasonable measure that will make it more efficient and more helpful in stimulating trade and commerce.

The appropriations which have been made heretofore, as I have indicated, have been very generous. The building containing the Department of Commerce is a most impressive one and houses thousands of employees.

I do not have before me the appropriations for this Department prior to 1922, but for that year they were \$17,000,000. In 1923 they were more than \$18,000,000. In 1924 they exceeded \$19,000,000, and in 1925 they were nearly \$24,000,000. In 1926 they were \$28,500,000; 1927, twenty-nine and three-quarter million; 1928, over \$36,000,000; and in 1929, \$38,000,000. Since then the appropriations have varied from year to year and in 1933 they were nearly thirty-three and one-half million dollars.

The bill under consideration carries over \$52,000,000.

In my opinion, the House committee was exceedingly generous in supporting a bill carrying so large a sum; and the Senate committee has kept pace with it.

The item under consideration is not very impressive, measured by the total amount of the bill, carrying, as stated, over \$52,000,000. However, as I have indicated, no sufficient reasons have been assigned to warrant the approval of the item under consideration. The hearings do not, in my opinion, justify the amendment now under consideration.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has read into the record what he claims to be a statement by Secretary Hopkins, appearing on pages 72 and 75. This statement proceeds:

I have prepared a statement which gives rather briefly the salient facts as to this item, which I would like to file and will then discuss the project in more detail, and will be glad to answer any questions you may wish to ask. \* \* \*

The purpose of the Department of Commerce is to promote trade and industry.

The committee, as well as the Senate, knows that that was the purpose for which the Department of Commerce was organized. Unfortunately, it has at times failed to measure up to that standard and, I fear, upon some occasions has placed impediments in the stream of trade and commerce.

The Secretary stated that there are eight bureaus in the Department. That was not news, as these bureaus had existed for some time, nor is the additional appropriation which is sought directly related to the bureaus referred to. The Secretary states that all of the bureaus are well run and well managed, with competent technical people doing what I consider to be a good job. I assume that the Secre-



tary claims that all of the bureaus are well managed and have competent and technical personnel. I might add that they cover substantially the entire field in which the fifty-odd individuals who are to be appointed if this item of the appropriation is approved, will operate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator that the testimony itself specifically states that the various specific organizations referred to do not perform the work he wants to do with these additional employees.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, you have heard read the statement of the Secretary and I do not think that it furnishes any reasons specific or otherwise which call for the creation of fifty-odd jobs in the Department. The Secretary refers to a number of bureaus, but I do not think it is intended that their activities are to be increased or their fields of jurisdiction enlarged. The various bureaus and agencies of the Department of Commerce have a common end in view, and they are so integrated and their activities so synchronized as to be promotive of the primary purpose for which the Department of Commerce was organized. I should add that the Secretary in his statement stated, "I did not find when I assumed the office any effective machinery to assist in what seems to me to be the most important purpose of the whole Department."

I am somewhat surprised at the statement but do not intend to be critical of this view expressed by the Secretary. I can only say that with the agencies and bureaus which have been operating for years—agencies and bureaus which are, as the Secretary states "well-run, well-managed, with competent technical people, doing a good job"—I am somewhat at a loss to understand what the Secretary has in mind. Certainly the Department, under the direction of Secretary Hopkins' predecessors, has had in view the development of our foreign and domestic commerce. Its field of operations have been marked out years ago and its plans have, in the main, been carried into effect. It is true that we are suffering from a rather serious depression but I do not interpret the testimony of the Secretary as offering any remedies not now available and which must be available under the present set-up of the Department. The testimony of the Secretary does not, as I interpret it, submit a broader or wider field of activity or a more satisfactory foundation upon which to base our economic and industrial system.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I submit there might be one point with respect to which the Secretary intends to do something that was not done before, because under the statement of the Senator from Tennessee he proposes to do something that will be welcomed by businessmen.

Mr. KING. Well, I am a little in doubt as to the implication. I do not know what he has stated that would aid business. The Secretary states:

In going over the organic act as passed by Congress covering the fundamental purpose of the Department, I found that it was to promote trade and commerce \* \* \*.

These important questions—

Apparently there have been no important questions dealt with by the Department until Mr. Hopkins came into the Department—

These important questions are, namely, how should a big industry be related to our economic system in a way to make it the most effective and to employ more labor; what is the proper relationship of government to these great industries?

Mr. President, are we to suppose that the activities of the President of the United States and the various departments of the Government now and in the past have not been concerned with these important matters and have not made any contribution to the proper integration of business in the Government and the proper synchronization of the various activities in our economic and industrial life?

Are we now to have something new; are we to have a definite solution of the relation between big industry, as Mr. Hopkins denominated, and the Government itself? What is there in the testimony that indicates that the Department of Commerce has been reorganized or is about to be revitalized or its policies to be changed? What new course is to be charted by the Department of Commerce under the new Secretary?

The record, as I read it, is silent upon these questions. Reference is made in a sort of casual way as to the question of utilities. This is not a new matter. It has been before the Congress for years, and the T. V. A. and other utilities have received the scrutiny of Congress and have been subjected more or less to the control and surveillance of executive agencies.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] asked the Secretary:

Can you give us a break-down, Mr. Secretary, as to what you want.

Senator TAFT. What the \$255,000 is for.

Secretary HOPKINS. I have a break-down which I will file later, Senator. (See p. 82.)

And the break-down, turning to page 82, is as follows:

Additional personnel to be provided for office of the Secretary, Department of Commerce.

Increase in personnel with \$9,000 salary per annum, five. Increase of personnel in the \$7,500 category, each receiving \$7,500, five; five having \$5,000, five having \$4,000, five having \$3,800, five having \$3,200, and five having \$2,000 each. That comprises the increase in the personnel and the salaries which will be paid to each group, so that the two-hundred-and-some-odd-thousand dollars is to be paid to these individuals in the groups to which I have referred.

That is all the information we have received. The Department of Commerce—whether under Republican or Democratic administrations—has, generally speaking, rendered valuable services to our country. It may be that important changes will be made in its administration—new rules adopted; new plans formulated. The record, however, furnishes no information that justifies the prophecy that important reforms will be made and greater efficiency realized, or that the results of its activities will be more satisfactory or beneficial to the country. Be that as it may, all Senators will receive with satisfaction evidence of a more dynamic, effective, and useful agency. Our foreign trade has been increased and our domestic situation materially improved. If the Department of Commerce can point the way to improved conditions, it will receive the commendation of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment on page 58, beginning in line 17—

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry, Mr. President. There are several objections. Let us have a vote on this item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 58, beginning in line 17. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lee	Schwartz
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Frazier	Logan	Sheppard
Barbour	Gerry	Lucas	Smith
Barkley	Gibson	McCarran	Stewart
Bone	Gillette	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Green	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Truman
Bulow	Gurney	Mead	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hale	Minton	Van Nuys
Capper	Hatch	Neely	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	Norris	Wheeler
Chavez	Hill	Nye	White
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Pepper	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	
Connally	King	Reed	
Danaher	La Follette	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the committee amendment on page 58, commencing in line 17.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS (when Mr. SLATTERY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SLATTERY] is unavoidably detained from the Senate Chamber. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] who, I understand, if present, would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is unavoidably detained.

I am advised that, if present and voting, those Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is attending a committee meeting and is unable to be present.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] have been called to government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. I am advised that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] would vote "nay" if present.

I also announce that my colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Ohio would vote "nay" and the Senator from New York would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. If present, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 23, as follows:

## YEAS—41

Bankhead	Byrnes	Clark, Mo.	Guffey
Barkley	Caraway	Connally	Hatch
Bone	Chavez	Ellender	Hayden
Brown	Clark, Idaho	Green	Hill

Hughes  
La Follette  
Lee  
Logan  
Lucas  
McCarran  
McKellar

Maloney  
Mead  
Minton  
Neely  
Norris  
Nye  
Pepper

Pittman  
Russell  
Schwartz  
Schwellenbach  
Sheppard  
Stewart  
Thomas, Okla.

Thomas, Utah  
Truman  
Walsh  
Wheeler

## NAYS—23

Adams  
Bailey  
Barbour  
Borah  
Bulow  
Capper

Danaher  
Davis  
Frazier  
Gerry  
Gibson  
Gillette

Gurney  
Hale  
Johnson, Calif.  
King  
Lodge  
McNary

Reed  
Vandenberg  
Van Nuys  
White  
Wiley

## NOT VOTING—32

Andrews  
Ashurst  
Austin  
Bilbo  
Bridges  
Burke  
Byrd  
Donahay

Downey  
George  
Glass  
Harrison  
Herring  
Holman  
Holt  
Johnson, Colo.

Lundeen  
Miller  
Murray  
O'Mahoney  
Overton  
Radcliffe  
Reynolds  
Shipstead

Slattery  
Smathers  
Smith  
Taft  
Tobey  
Townsend  
Tydings  
Wagner

So the amendment of the committee on page 58, line 17, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of Commerce", on page 59, line 25, before the word "which", to strike out "\$80,500" and insert "\$100,500", so as to read:

Contingent expenses: For contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the offices and bureaus of the Department, except the Patent Office and the Bureau of the Census, including those for which appropriations for contingent and miscellaneous expenses are specifically made, including professional and scientific books, law-books, books of reference, periodicals, blank books, pamphlets, maps, newspapers (not exceeding \$1,500); purchase of atlases or maps; stationery; furniture and repairs to same; carpets, matting, oilcloth, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges; fuel, lighting, and heating; purchase and exchange of motor-trucks and bicycles; maintenance, repair, and operation of three motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles (one for the Secretary of Commerce and two for the general use of the Department), and motor-trucks and bicycles, to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges; postage to foreign countries; telegraph and telephone service; teletype service and tolls (not to exceed \$1,000); typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; first-aid outfits for use in the buildings occupied by employees of this Department; and all other necessary miscellaneous items including examination of estimates of appropriation in the field not included in the foregoing, \$100,500, which sum shall constitute the appropriation for contingent expenses of the Department, except the Patent Office and the Bureau of the Census, and shall also be available for the purchase of necessary supplies and equipment for field services of bureaus and offices of the Department for which contingent and miscellaneous appropriations are specifically made in order to facilitate the purchase through the central purchasing office (Division of Purchases and Sales) as provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 22, after "(33 Stat. 508)", to strike out "\$455,900" and insert "\$468,400", so as to read:

Traveling expenses: For all necessary traveling expenses under the Department of Commerce, including all bureaus and divisions thereunder except the Bureau of the Census, and traveling expenses for the examinations authorized by the act entitled "An act to provide for retirement for disability in the Lighthouse Service", approved March 4, 1925 (33 U. S. C. 765), but not including travel properly chargeable to the appropriation herein for "Transportation of families and effects of officers and employees and allowances for living quarters", Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: *Provided*, That not exceeding \$3,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the hire of automobiles for travel on official business, without regard to the provisions of the act of July 16, 1914 (38 Stat. 503), \$468,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce", on page 62, line 25, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$313,000", so as to read:

District and cooperative office service: For all expenses necessary to operate and maintain district and cooperative offices, including personal services, rent outside of the District of Columbia, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, and computing machines, accessories, and repairs, purchase of maps, books of reference, and periodicals, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, newspapers, both



foreign and domestic (not exceeding \$300), and all other publications necessary for the promotion of the commercial interests of the United States, and all other necessary incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, \$313,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 12, after "(5 U. S. C. 70)", to strike out "\$153,000" and insert "\$164,000", so as to read:

Transportation of families and effects of officers and employees and allowances for living quarters: To pay the traveling expenses and expenses of transportation, under such regulations as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe, of families and effects of officers and employees of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in going to and returning from their posts, or when traveling under the order of the Secretary of Commerce, and also for defraying the expenses of preparing and transporting the remains of officers and employees of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce who may die abroad or in transit, while in the discharge of their official duties, to their former homes in this country, or to a place not more distant, for interment, and for the ordinary expenses of such interment; to enable the Secretary of Commerce, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), to furnish the officers and employees in the Foreign Commerce Service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce stationed in a foreign country, without cost to them and within the limits of this appropriation, allowances for living quarters, heat, and light, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 70), \$164,000: *Provided*, That the maximum allowance to any officer or employee shall not exceed \$1,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards", on page 71, line 6, before the word "equipment", to strike out "plan" and insert "plant", so as to read:

Operation and administration: For the general operation and administration of the Bureau; improvement and care of the grounds; plant equipment; necessary repairs and alterations to buildings, \$275,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 8, after the figures "\$715,000", to insert a comma and "of which \$75,000 shall be available for the development of pH standards", so as to read:

Research and development: For the maintenance and development of national standards of measurement; the development of improved methods of measurement; the determination of physical constants and the properties of materials; the investigation of mechanisms and structures, including their economy, efficiency, and safety; the study of fluid resistance and the flow of fluids and heat; the investigation of radiation, radioactive substances, and X-rays; the study of conditions affecting radio transmission; the development of methods of chemical analysis and synthesis, and the investigation of the properties of rare substances; investigations relating to the utilization of materials, including lubricants and liquid fuels; the study of new processes and methods of fabrication; and the solutions of problems arising in connection with standards, \$715,000, of which \$75,000 shall be available for the development of pH standards.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73 after line 3, to insert:

Additional land: For enlarging the site of the National Bureau of Standards by the purchase of 12.5 acres of land, more or less, including improvements thereon, being parcels Ncs. 44/4, 44/5, 44/34, 44/44, and 44/45 in the District of Columbia, adjacent to the present site of the National Bureau of Standards, \$100,000, to be available immediately.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 10, after the words "Standards", to strike out "\$2,166,000" and insert "\$2,266,000", so as to read:

Total, National Bureau of Standards, \$2,266,000, of which amount not to exceed \$1,914,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey", on page 81, line 12, after the word "chandlery", to strike out "\$65,000" and insert "\$70,000", so as to read:

Vessels: For repair of vessels, and replacement of equipment thereon, exclusive of engineers' supplies and other ship chandlery, \$70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Fisheries", on page 84, line 22, before the word "including", to strike out "\$930,000" and insert "\$949,400"; and on page 85, line 3, after the word "expenses", to insert a comma and "and including not to exceed \$20,000 for the completion of fish cultural station at Arcadia, R. I., including construction of buildings and ponds, water supply, improvements to grounds, purchase of equipment, and all other necessary expenses", so as to read:

Propagation of food fishes: For maintenance, repair, alteration, improvement, equipment, acquisition, and operation of fish-cultural stations, general propagation of food fishes and their distribution, including movement, maintenance, and repairs of cars and not to exceed \$15,000 for purchase of trucks for fish distribution; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in the field; purchase of equipment (including rubber boots, oilskins, and first-aid outfits), and apparatus; contingent expenses; pay of permanent employees not to exceed \$454,250; temporary labor; not to exceed \$10,000 for propagation and distribution of fresh-water mussels and the necessary expenses connected therewith; purchase, collection, and transportation of specimens and other expenses incidental to the maintenance and operation of aquarium, \$949,400, including not to exceed \$155,000 to establish or commence the establishment of stations authorized by the act approved May 21, 1930 (43 Stat. 371), including the acquisition of necessary land, construction of buildings and ponds, water supply, improvements to grounds, purchase of equipment, and all other necessary expenses, and including not to exceed \$20,000 for the completion of fish cultural station at Arcadia, R. I., including construction of buildings and ponds, water supply, improvements to grounds, purchase of equipment, and all other necessary expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$56,760" and insert "\$61,960"; and on page 88, line 3, after the word "field", to strike out "\$72,500" and insert "\$80,000", so as to read:

Fishery industries: For collection and compilation of statistics of the fisheries and the study of their methods and relations, and the methods of preservation and utilization of fishery products, and to enable the Secretary of Commerce to execute the functions imposed upon him by the act entitled "An act authorizing associations of producers of aquatic products", approved June 25, 1934 (48 Stat. 1213), including pay of permanent employees not to exceed \$61,960, compensation of temporary employees, preparation of reports, contract stenographic reporting services, and all other necessary expenses in connection therewith, including the purchase (not to exceed \$1,100), exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in the field, \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which has been heretofore printed. I offer the amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$750,000."

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I realize how easy it is to talk economy in the abstract, and in the specific to suggest, as I have done in this instance, an increase in an appropriation.

This is an appropriation, however, in which I have been greatly interested for a number of years; and I should like to make a brief statement in support of the increase which is suggested in the amendment I have offered.

The \$300,000 item enables the Federal Bureau of Investigation to meet special demands made of it in connection with kidnaping, extortion, bank robbing, espionage cases, and so forth, and was inserted in the bill in the House after Director J. Edgar Hoover told the House Appropriations Committee that the F. B. I. field force, as well as the departmental organization in Washington, were far behind in their work.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall, I instructed the clerk of the committee to invite the Department to make any suggestions

they desired as to amendments in the Senate; and no suggestions of amendments in the Senate were made by the Department or by the F. B. I.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, of course, I realize that that must be so if the able Senator from Tennessee says it is so. But—

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator a question. My recollection is that it was said that the crime of kidnaping has decreased and is decreasing very rapidly.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is true, Mr. President, thanks to the F. B. I.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under those circumstances, why should we increase the appropriation? The House appropriated the amount of the Budget estimate. No Budget estimate for any greater sum has been made. The Senate approved the Budget estimate.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, the duties and responsibilities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of course, are not confined to kidnaping alone. For instance, with 10,300,000 sets of fingerprints on file, an increase of 1,400,000 in the last year, and more than 10,000 law-enforcement agencies contributing to these files, this work alone has reached a point never contemplated a few years ago, and will enable the Government to identify many thousands of gangsters, criminals, and men with criminal records who never could have been apprehended except for the effectiveness of this field phase of the F. B. I.'s activities. That is an activity which the Senator from Tennessee does not mention. There are many others.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, in line 4, on page 36, \$7,000,000 is appropriated for this Bureau. That was the Budget estimate. The House allowed it, and the Senate committee allowed it. My recollection is that the additional sum of \$300,000 appropriated this year for salaries and expenses for certain emergencies was \$150,000 last year.

The appropriation is doubled in this year's bill, and there has been no request from the Department or from the F. B. I. to increase the appropriation over \$300,000. There is no Budget estimate, and the amendment is not in order. I hope the Senator will not insist on the amendment. I am so very devoted to the Senator personally that I do not like to object to anything he asks.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am very grateful for that sentiment; but I have considerable data here which, frankly, I want to present as briefly as I can, because even with the opposition of the able Senator from Tennessee to my amendment, I feel the facts are worthy of being recited at this time.

To begin with, I wish to say that I know, as the Senator knows, and I am sure a great many other Senators know, that the Director of this startlingly successful and dramatic Bureau of the Government did ask for the appropriation of \$750,000, and that was cut down to the amount which appears in the pending bill; namely, \$300,000. I know of no activity of the Government which is more meritorious or more entitled to financial support than this one.

Let me point out further, if I may, that this is the one activity of the Government which brings in a great deal more money than is expended upon it, in the way of recovery of huge sums which have been stolen and embezzled, and money restored from kidnaping ransoms recovered by the Bureau.

As a matter of fact, since the activities of the F. B. I. under Director Hoover result each year in fines, savings, or recoveries equal to nearly eight times the amounts appropriated by Congress for its work, it is obvious that any reasonable increase in its appropriation will return substantial dividends not alone in better law enforcement but actually in dollars and cents—in dollars and cents many times more than the amount authorized by this amendment.

With 10,300,000 sets of fingerprints on file, an increase of 1,400,000 in the last year, and more than 10,000 law-enforcement agencies contributing to these files, this work alone has reached a point never dreamed of a few years ago, and enabled the Government to identify many thousands of fugitives, criminals, and men with police records, who could never

have been apprehended except for the effectiveness of this one phase of the F. B. I.'s activity. Seven thousand fugitives from justice were apprehended last year, and the work of the F. B. I. has been invaluable in weeding out police characters from the public service and other public rolls.

In Richmond, Va., it was discovered that out of 2,587 transients whose fingerprints were taken when they applied for relief 1,651 had police records and half of this number were guilty of serious crimes, including murder and rape. The ten-millionth fingerprint record, received in February, was that of a man charged with forgery by the police in Sacramento, Calif. They knew nothing of his previous record. The F. B. I. fingerprint file showed he was wanted under another name for criminal assault and murder in 1936, and there had been other convictions before that.

In the Federal civil service 1 out of 13 appointees was found to have police records. Through the work of the F. B. I., this ratio has been reduced to 1 to 41.

Mr. Hoover tells us there are 14,067 criminals in the United States who can be classified as public enemies. Of this number, only 2,000 are in penal institutions now. These are men with long criminal records, from whom fresh crimes may be expected. We even find men trying to become police officers or obtain other positions of trust who at the time of application are fugitives from justice or men who have been convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude.

Up to last year the Government was called on to deal with an average of 35 espionage cases a year. Last year, 634 such cases were reported. So effectively has the F. B. I. handled this type of cases for the Army and Navy that it has been asked to establish offices in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska, in addition to the Panama Canal Zone and the Philippines. It has been impossible to do so because of inadequate appropriations.

As everyone knows, kidnaping cases reach into some of the most remote parts of the country. The trail in the Ross case extended from Chicago into the north woods of Minnesota and Wisconsin, into Michigan, New York, south to Florida and Louisiana, then west to California and back to Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois. In the Levine kidnaping case, F. B. I. agents interviewed 8,500 persons, in the Fried case 12,450 persons, and in the Mattson case more than 12,000 persons. Since enactment of the so-called Lindbergh law, the F. B. I. has solved 152 out of 154 kidnaping cases investigated, and brought the criminals to justice.

Bank robberies have dropped from 419 in 1934 to 116 in 1938, notwithstanding an increase in the meantime in the number of banks in which the F. B. I. has jurisdiction, largely as a result of its good work in catching bank robbers.

The record is conclusive. The effectiveness of the F. B. I. has made this agency incomparable in an era when there is too often more interest in spending than in getting results—results which in this instance actually pay dividends in not only curbing crime, but in bringing in actual dollars and cents to the heavily burdened taxpayers. Mr. Hoover has built up the best investigating force in the world, not excepting Scotland Yard, and we must not deny it the relatively small fund needed to enable it to meet the responsibilities thrust on it by Congress, or assumed voluntarily in response to public opinion.

I repeat, for some reason or other, perhaps because politics is so completely eliminated in this particular bureau, there does not seem to be the enthusiasm for it as is the case with many other departments of the Government these days.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KING. I think there has been a great deal of enthusiasm for the Bureau to which the Senator refers, because it was but a few years ago when the appropriation was one or two million dollars, then we raised it to five million, and now it is up to seven million. I think we have been very generous not only with respect to this Bureau, but with the entire Department of Justice, because in the pending bill we are appropriating \$50,000,000 for this Department.



Mr. BARBOUR. Of course, those sums are all large, but everything is by comparison. As I stated before, there is no more dramatic story in the whole Federal Establishment than in the work being done under administrative handicaps and against great odds by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The increase I am proposing in the emergency fund already approved by the House would simply enable the F. B. I. to dispose of some of the more than 6,000 accumulated cases now awaiting investigation, and meet a part of the additional load being thrown on it all the time as a consequence of new laws and the concentration of all fingerprint files in the bureau, including those of the Army.

Anyway, no matter what may be the result of my efforts on this occasion, I shall fight for this particular activity every time I have the opportunity.

I have sufficient confidence in Director Hoover to know that when he comes before the Congress asking for a sum of money he can justify his request, and that the money, every penny of it, will be well spent.

Mr. President, I hope most earnestly that the amendment I have proposed will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey. The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6392) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING—RULES OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to and to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from the National Association of Broadcasters, together with several editorials from various newspapers throughout the country. I wish in particular to call attention to the fact that the Federal Communications Commission on May 23 adopted some new rules and regulations respecting international broadcasting. Among the rules which they adopted was the following:

A licensee of an international broadcast station shall render only an international broadcast service which will reflect the culture of this country and which will promote international good will, understanding, and cooperation.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that if that rule should stand, it would give the Commission the right to censor the broadcasting of speeches by Members of the United States Senate. In other words, if I or some other Senator desired to make a speech on international questions over an international radio, the rule would give the Commission the right to say that the speech which was about to be made did not reflect the culture of the country, and might possibly stir up bad feelings in some other country. It is a form of censorship which the Congress of the United States never contemplated when it passed the law. On the contrary, Congress specifically provided that there should be no censorship.

I think everybody who is interested in the subject agrees that the radio must be free from censorship. I am told that the broadcasting companies and the National Association of Broadcasters are asking for a hearing upon this particular matter. The rule was adopted without any hearing. I sincerely hope the Commission will grant a hearing to the broadcasting companies, and I sincerely hope they will modify a rule which would tend to bring about censor-

ship in the United States over national and international broadcasting.

I have here a number of clippings from various newspapers throughout the country. They are from Ohio, Indiana, Boston, Omaha, and various other States and cities throughout the United States. I ask unanimous consent that both the letter and the clippings be included in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter and newspaper clippings are as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS,  
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1939.

The Honorable FRANK R. McNINCH,

Chairman, Federal Communications Commission,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McNINCH: On May 23, 1939, the Commission promulgated new rules and regulations for the operation of international broadcast stations. These rules included new and unprecedented restrictions and requirements as to program content and were issued without prior public hearing. Of the nine licensees operating 14 international broadcast stations, the majority are members of the National Association of Broadcasters. This organization has a committee for the study and coordination of international broadcasting and is now accumulating more comprehensive information in this field than has been available. Meanwhile, however, these new rules and regulations precipitate certain fundamental questions which are a matter of vital concern to broadcasting generally and to the entire American public. It is to these more fundamental matters that we address ourselves.

Paragraph (a) of section 42.03 of the new regulations provides that "A licensee of an international broadcast station shall render only an international broadcast service which will reflect the culture of this country and which will promote international good will, understanding, and cooperation." It is submitted that the question as to whether a specific program reflects the culture of this country or promotes, at any given moment, international good will, understanding, and cooperation, is a matter upon which there may be sharp differences of opinion. A literal interpretation of this regulation would, for example, require a licensee to suppress spokesmen for minority groups if either the licensee or the Commission thought their views would not promote "international good will, understanding, and cooperation." Freedom of speech as an integral part of the culture of this country not only is a cherished tradition but a living reality. Any requirement that international broadcast stations suppress a speaker because his remarks might not promote "international good will, understanding, and cooperation" would, therefore, seem to be in conflict with the requirement that the service rendered by an international broadcast station "reflect the culture of this country."

We are advised by several licensees of international broadcast stations that foreign listeners rely upon stations in the United States as a source for unbiased and uncensored news of the world. This reliance is based upon the fact that these listeners know that in the United States there is no governmental supervision or control over the matter to be broadcast. In many other countries broadcasting is an instrument of the government and listeners to their stations are aware of the fact that their programs, including news reports and information on current events, are colored to fit the philosophy and views of the government. The consequent distortion of news into self-serving propaganda has evoked a growing resentment toward the countries from which it emanates, and such resentment has reacted to enhance foreign respect for the present impartial dissemination of programs from the United States. We, therefore, feel that the confidence that has been developed in the independent operations of American short-wave stations will be destroyed when it becomes known that an agency of the Government of the United States has laid down requirements to control the program content of these stations.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the existence of this regulation (42.03 (a)) needlessly places this Government in a position which we believe to be contrary to our traditional policy in the field of foreign relations. There are abundant examples of instances in which some citizen of the United States has made certain utterances by radio or through the press which have aroused the antagonism of the representatives of foreign powers. It has been the customary reply of our State Department to the protests by offended powers that this country is one in which freedom of speech is an actuality and the Government has no power to abridge this fundamental right. The regulation which we are discussing definitely implies official responsibility for all matter broadcast over international stations. This we believe is unsound policy and incompatible with the operation of broadcast stations by private enterprise in a democracy. It would seem equally appropriate to require Government supervision and censorship of all matter contained in American newspapers circulated abroad which use the facilities of the American merchant marine or the second-class mail for delivery. This analogy, we believe, clearly demonstrates the errors and the immediate dangers of the policy which this new regulation embodies.

We likewise desire to invite your attention to paragraph (b) of section 42.03, which places further restrictions upon program content to the extent that it limits and prescribes the type of commercial advertisement which can be made, the type of commodity which can be advertised, and then excludes all commercial or sponsored

programs that "are not consistent with the purpose or intent of this section." Such regulations are neither desirable nor necessary nor susceptible to sufficient clarity of interpretation or agreement as to meaning to permit them to be practically applied. If international broadcasting is to be continued as an instrument of private enterprise, we feel that the regulatory authority should confine its functions to questions of technical efficiency, allocation, and general performance in the public interest.

It seems appropriate to emphasize that the record of licensees in the international broadcast field has been one of greatly increasing service to foreign listeners. During the past 2 years there has been a marked development of facilities and personnel by the various private licensees. Their programs are being exclusively designed for international audiences. The responses that have been received indicate that foreign listeners appreciate the fact that these programs, reflecting as they do a living pattern of our democracy, have not undertaken to propagandize any political ideology. This should be continued, because the most effective way to develop and foster international good will by the United States is to avoid copying the tactics of totalitarian governments who supervise and direct all broadcasting.

Finally, we have been unable to find a legal basis for the regulations which we have discussed. It need only be pointed out that the authority for all powers exercised by the Commission must be found in the act itself, and that such authority must be expressly conferred or follow by necessary implication from powers expressly conferred. In this case we can find neither. While the Communications Act of 1934 clothes the Commission with extremely broad powers on matters of allocation and the technical and physical operations of broadcast stations, we can find nothing in the act or in the several decisions of the court which have been based upon this act to support this character of regulation. We have been unable to find any provision of the act or decision of the court which would authorize the Commission to pass upon the content of programs broadcast either directly by prior examination of the program material or indirectly by imposing requirements which will have the same effect.

The Federal Communications Act of 1934 is silent on the subject of program content. Not only does this absence of language support our conclusions that the Commission is without authority to regulate program content as such, whether in the international or domestic broadcasting field, but it should be particularly noted that the statutes expressly prohibit censorship in any form. We desire to emphasize the language in section 326, which states:

"Nothing in this act shall be understood or construed to give the Commission the power of censorship over the radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station, and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication."

If the Commission has the authority to promulgate this character of regulation in the international field, it must have equal authority with respect to domestic broadcasting, as the same provisions of the law govern both classifications. If licensees of international broadcast stations can be required to restrict their programs to any regulatory authority's concept of American culture, it would seem clear that the licensees of domestic broadcasting stations could be required to limit their programs to some "official" definition of culture, education, and entertainment. That this would constitute a violent transgression of the basic principles of American democracy is self-evident. We further submit that the proposed regulations would establish the precedent for such transgression, and surely no such dangerous prerogative is contemplated by the Communications Act of 1934 and is in direct conflict with section 326 of the act, which expressly prohibits any type or character of censorship or any condition or regulation "which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication."

In view of the importance of the subject itself, and in further view of the necessary implications to which the adoption of such regulations give rise, we request that the Commission follow the same course selected by it in the adoption and promulgation of rules and regulations governing the domestic operation of broadcast stations, and that it conduct hearings on these regulations. We further request that the Commission reconsider its action of May 23, 1939, and postpone final action until such time as an opportunity may be given for the conduct of a hearing upon the questions above referred to and others which are necessarily involved in the consideration of this subject.

Very respectfully yours,

NEVILLE MILLER.

[From the Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph Forum of May 31, 1939]

#### KEEP RADIO INDEPENDENCE

Refusal by the British Broadcasting Co., which dictatorially controls all radiocasts on the islands, to permit the world broadcast of the Duke of Windsor, formerly King Edward, to be heard by Britishers should have been a warning to the United States to fight any move that is made to seize similar control here. It is recalled that a few days after the famous Wells broadcast, which stirred the country into thinking that an army from Mars was coming down to earth to wipe out civilization, a Pennsylvania editor wrote an editorial, a copy of which was received by the Telegraph Forum, in which he advocated Federal control of all radio programs. The editor apparently overlooked one vital point in his great rush to

get his opinion of a more or less laughable situation before the people of his community.

He overlooked that once the Government is given control of one branch of any kind of industry it would not be long before it would have another hunk and so on until it would have it all. Apparently having noted this particular editorial comment, Frank R. McNinch, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, ruled aloud that the Government must stay out of the radio censoring field. The gentleman is right.

It is not argued here that radio has not made some mistakes. The Wells broadcast was a mistake, but where is there an industry which has not made mistakes? Because a child makes a mistake is no reason to put that child under a dictatorship which would not permit it to have any future self-control. Because an industry makes a mistake is no reason for the Government to take it over. The Government, too, makes mistakes, in fact, many more than are made by industry. No industry would double its indebtedness in 5 years and then announce that it intends to keep on running into debt. Bankruptcy courts have records of all those which have tried to operate under such a system.

The Wells broadcast will, it is safe to say, not happen again. The Mae West radio fuss of a year or so ago was corrected at once. Radio has shown a desire to correct its ills as they appear. No industry and no person can make such corrections before they appear. To impose a Federal censorship merely because one program happened to stir up an hour's fuss would be to announce to the world that the newest American industry is without sufficient common sense to run its own affairs.

Even censors, almighty as some of them think they are, make mistakes. Who corrects them? Under the Pennsylvania editor's suggestion these censors would be the final word. If they made a mistake the public would have to take it and like it, or else. The system as it operates today provides a double check by both the industry and the Government when checking is necessary. It should not be changed.

[From the Muncie (Ind.) Press of May 29, 1939]

#### CENSORSHIP OVER THE RADIO?

Only "international programs of good will" are to be broadcast from the United States if an order of the Federal Communications Commission is to be obeyed. That such an order should go forth from the Commission would be unbelievable if it were not true. Nothing could more clearly demonstrate the way some agencies of the administration are trekking down the road toward suppression of free speech and a free press except an order from somebody in Federal authority demanding that newspapers not print anything about a certain subject, or to print only what the Government said on such a subject. There is the wide difference, of course, that no newspaper worthy of the name would pay attention to such an order, whereas the broadcasting companies apparently are compelled to do so. They are licensed only for 6 months at a time, and the Communications Commission can take away these licenses almost whenever it pleases.

It is to be hoped that some broadcasting concern with plenty of money to back it up accepts this challenge to freedom of the air and sends out a program objectionable to the Commission in order that a test case of it may be made in the courts. Somewhere it should be able to obtain redress.

If the Federal Government or any of its agencies assumes the right to dictate what kind of programs may and may not be served over the air—barring, of course, those that are objectionable for moral reasons—then it might consistently deny to citizens the right to assemble peaceably to protest against the acts of the Government or for any other purpose. The next step might be an attempt to censor the press, thus throwing aside the Constitution as an instrument no longer having supreme authority.

The Communications Commission may back up its stand by saying that the Constitution says nothing about radio broadcasting, since there was no such thing as radio when the Constitution became the primal law of the Nation. But the same principle is involved as is concerned with freedom of speech and press; and, indeed, freedom of speech, even if over the ether, is thus directly affected.

It has only been a few days ago that the President said that the authority of the Government over radio was limited to "such controls of operation as are necessary to prevent complete confusion on the air," and that "in all other respects the radio is as free as the press."

This statement is completely in accord with the popular conception of the position that radio holds. Mr. Roosevelt now should see to it that his Commission rescinds its order. If he does not, then it is up to the broadcasting companies themselves to take action. In the meantime, the President would meet general approval if he were to change the personnel of the Commission. It evidently does not know that its authority is limited, or does not care.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Transcript of May 25, 1939]

#### INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTS

The Federal Communications Commission has raised a nice problem in its most recent ruling. Henceforth the Commission will require that licensees of international broadcasting stations in the United States "shall render only an international broadcast service which will reflect the culture of this country and which will promote international good will, understanding, and cooperation." Is this a deprivation of free speech, unwarrantable censorship of



the air waves? Or is it a necessary protection against abuse of the broadcasting privilege for propagandistic purposes?

Those questions are not easily answered. The ruling was made as the result of complaints that a New Jersey station was broadcasting anti-Semitic programs for the benefit of foreign listeners. Americans certainly do not want the rest of the world to get the idea that we sympathize with that sort of doctrine. Such programs, we feel, have no place on either the domestic or the international air waves. But does that mean that no minority in America shall be allowed to broadcast its message to foreign lands? Does it mean that Earl Browder, for example, running for President in 1940, will be allowed to address American audiences, but not foreign ones? Do civil liberties, like party politics, stop at the water's edge?

The Commission has used its broad powers over domestic broadcasting with laudable discretion. There is no cause for immediate concern lest the ruling on international broadcasts be abused. In fact, the license of the New Jersey station whose misconduct apparently prompted the ruling has just been renewed after a 6 month's suspension. The action of the Commission appears to be a compromise between the majority members who still favor free speech on the air and the minority members who advocate some sort of censorship. But it makes us uneasy to have the power of the Commission clamp down, when and if it pleases, reaffirmed.

Radio has vastly increased the influence of the spoken word. It calls, perhaps, for a greater degree of public regulation than any other means of communication. International broadcasters have a greater responsibility than domestic ones. Still, the test of civil liberties is always in their most difficult application. It is reasonable to ask if the ruling of the F. C. C. really promotes the "public interest," which is its excuse. Is American culture reflected at its best in the fact or threat of censorship? If no real censorship is intended, will good will be promoted by creating the impression abroad that all our international broadcasts have the approval of the Federal Government through the F. C. C.? By assuming the responsibility for our foreign broadcasts in word the F. C. C. may be forced to accept it in fact.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of June 2, 1939]  
CENSORSHIPS

A recent order of the Federal Communications Commission is regarded by David Lawrence as "one of the most important things that has happened since radio began to be regulated."

The order was to radio stations that they broadcast only international programs of good will.

If uncorrected, this careful student of government asserts, it "means the beginning of a Fascist censorship of the press as well as the radio in America."

For by this rule the Government asserts a right to dictate what shall and shall not be said over the radio—to control the content of radio programs.

There are honest differences of opinion as to what constitutes good will. Also, it may be contended that an American citizen, speaking over the radio so that Germans may hear him, is entitled to express even a definite ill-will toward the Nazi regime if his convictions so impel him. Mr. Roosevelt has exercised that right; so has Secretary Ickes; so have many newspapers and periodicals that penetrate beyond the German borders.

If government may deny to citizens using the radio a right exercised by itself, then, says Lawrence, it may next assert a like power over the press.

For it is "a short step" to hold that since newspapers are transmitted through the mails "they can be regulated as to their content." Meanwhile "speakers can be kept from public appearances in any form of radio facilities if their ideas of 'good will' do not correspond with those of the Government censors in Washington."

The encroachment of bureaucracy upon civil liberties, upon the personal and property rights of citizens, are sometimes insidious, almost imperceptible. At other times they are bold and challenging. But it is in the very nature of things that they are persistent. Power grows by what it feeds upon. It is tormented by a chronic itch to extend and exercise itself.

And that is why the old fogies of the "horse and buggy" days who organized our Federal Government stood in dread of its power. For that reason they limited and defined it as strictly as they knew how. They sought to weaken power by dividing the rights and responsibilities of its exercise—Federal and State; executive, legislative, and judicial; a Congress composed of two Houses rather than one, so that each might impose a check upon the other. And with each of the three branches of the Federal Government exercising a sort of veto right against the other two.

Extraordinary were the precautions taken by the Founding Fathers. The rights of the citizens to free speech, a free press, freedom of religion; their property rights; their sovereignty over their own government, these must be protected against the vaunting ambition of all Government, which is inherent.

Eternal vigilance is the price of the liberty the fathers of the Republic tried so hard to guarantee to all who were to come after them. That vigilance can be inspired and sustained only according to the degree in which the people value their liberty.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 25, 1939]  
A STEP TOWARD CENSORSHIP?

Presumably the Federal Communications Commission is thinking only of programs specifically destined for foreign nations when

it directs that the licensee of an international broadcast station "shall render only an international broadcast service which will reflect the culture of this country and which will promote international good will, understanding, and cooperation." But if this order be taken literally, it can be construed as authorizing strict Government supervision—which means censorship—over any local station whose programs may be heard outside of the United States. This in itself is reason enough to question the soundness of the ruling. When, in addition, the very broad terms of the ruling are considered, it is quite obvious that it could be so used as to enable direct Government interference in program making and broadcasting anywhere within the country.

When does a radio program fail to "reflect the culture of this country"? In Germany, when Herr Hitler came into power, a chamber of culture was formed, which undertook to eliminate everything that might be incompatible with German culture. Among other things which the Nazi government did was to prescribe rules for the conduct of newspaper editors, one of the chief provisions of which was that editors should withhold from publication anything which might "weaken German culture," or weaken the standing of the German people nationally or internationally. At a later date the Nazi government provided for what Dr. Goebbels called the polyform expression of a monofarm national will. Is this what is in the back of the minds of the members of the F. C. C.? Or is it simply that, having failed in other ways to do more than to frighten the broadcasting stations into compliance lest by offending the F. C. C. they might have their broadcasting licenses withdrawn, the F. C. C. now hopes to exercise direct control of the air in the good name of "the culture of this country"?

In time of war some sort of close regulation of what goes out over the air—especially to foreign nations—would probably be unavoidable. But, despite all the President's fears, we are not yet at war, and there is no need for supervision of programs by Government agents so that they will surely reflect the "culture of the country." German broadcasts for foreign consumption are closely directed by the Government—for Government ends. This is probably efficient. But however desirable it may be to have an efficient American propaganda abroad to counteract German and other foreign propaganda, this is not—and should not be—a Government function, either through the creation of an official Government broadcasting station or through Government control of broadcasting programs which may be overheard abroad, in the name of "the culture of the country." Such control is the entering wedge of the sort of regulation which spells censorship, and descent to totalitarianism has begun.

[From the Bristol (Conn.) Press of May 26, 1939]  
THE IMPLICATIONS OF RADIO CENSORSHIP

We are a bit puzzled by the ruling of the Federal Communications Commission that international broadcast stations must "render only an international broadcast service which will reflect the culture of this country and which will promote international good will, understanding, and cooperation." How strict is the censorship under this rule to be? Is it the first step toward a controlled radio domestically? Are we being placed in a position where the totalitarian states may point their finger at us and jeer at the censorship over a free people?

But there is a possibility that has deeper significance. If it is understood that all programs in the international field are endorsed or approved by a Government censor, then do not the programs reflect the official view of the administration in power? A speaker attacking, for instance, the philosophy of Germany, may cause the German Government to protest that international good will is not being promoted by the remarks. The speaker can take refuge in the statement that his remarks were approved by the censor. The Government takes the responsibility. It is a dangerous policy upon which the Federal Communications Commission has embarked—dangerous to American liberties and America's place in the family of nations.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of June 2, 1939]  
THE RADIO CONTROL ORDER

The Federal Communication Commission's new order governing broadcasts to foreign countries hardly seems to justify David Lawrence's fear that it "can mean the beginning of a Fascist censorship of the press as well as the radio in America." Nothing of that sort is in prospect. Even so it would have been wiser for the F. C. C. to attain the desired object by some other method.

It is an unwarranted assumption that if a regulation is applied to broadcasting it can by the same token be applied to newspapers. The physical limits of wave lengths, which require control of radio to prevent confusion on the air lanes, obviously give the Government a greater responsibility for that medium of communication than for the press.

Yet radio control should be handled with caution. The F. C. C.'s order requires stations to "render only an international broadcast service which will reflect the culture of this country and which will promote international good will, understanding, and cooperation."

Obviously there are differences of opinion as to what will promote good will and what will work against it. There may even be irreconcilable conflicts in subject matter which would aid good will in one foreign country but forfeit it in another. The order invites controversy, and it is not desirable that a Government agency should decide the motives and effects of a citizen's communication.

A more serious aspect of the order is that it tends to make the Government responsible for what the stations send out. When the Nazi regime protested press attacks in this country, Washington was able to reply that this was a free Nation, that the Government had no control over newspapers' opinion, and wanted none.

If the American Government now undertakes to see that broadcasts contain only sweetness and light, a foreign government which is offended by a radio speech may properly inquire whether it was in accord with this Government's idea of fostering good will.

In short, the F. C. C. is courting unnecessary controversy and responsibility; it might have accomplished its object indirectly without taking these risks. But its action need not make the American people fearful that freedom of the press is imperiled.

[From the Danville (Va.) Bee of May 31, 1939]

#### CULTURE OR CENSORSHIP

The Federal Communications Commission has joined the world-wide movement which proposes to ban from the world ether waves all bitterness and all propaganda which would seek to divide and to turn one group of people against another. Stations qualifying for international licenses from now on will have to agree to render "an international broadcast service which will reflect the culture of the Nation and promote international good will, understanding, and cooperation."

This, of course, is the virtual recognition of a world-wide censorship of the ether waves which will rule out very probably important minority views. It will be easy to interpret as something not promoting international good will an entirely sound argument if it happens to be in opposition to the principles of the administration or the government in power.

What the world interests of radio have seemingly entirely overlooked is the adroitly engineered "jamming" of stations of hostile countries by those of another country and a failure to comply rigidly with the allotted wavelengths assigned under the international scheme of things.

It is no mere quirk of the atmosphere and no singular performance of the Heavyside Layer which occasions heavy interference by a German station whenever a British broadcasting station undertakes to communicate important world happenings. Nor is it accident which makes the station at Rome assume the overlapping characteristic which performs the same service—that of blanketing another wavelength.

However, much the foreign powers may be willing to subscribe to a new academic policy of "charity toward all"—thereby destroying much of the meat of radio communication they need more than anything to be prevented from deliberate physical interferences and pirating which have considerable significance in a day when certain governments deliberately set out to prevent large masses of people from learning what actually is going on in world affairs.

#### TODAY IN WASHINGTON—RADIO ORDER SHOWS TREND TOWARD PRESS CENSORSHIP

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—The Federal Communications Commission has just made a blunder which, if uncorrected, can mean the beginning of a Fascist censorship of the press as well as the radio in America. The ordering of radio stations to broadcast only international programs of good will is a form of regulation by the Government of what shall or shall not be said over the radio.

This restriction is contrary to what President Roosevelt himself promised on May 9 in a public statement in which he limited the function of Government as to radio merely "to such controls of operation as are necessary to prevent complete confusion on the air." He then added:

"In all other respects the radio is as free as the press."

Mr. Roosevelt, in his brief comment, repeated what the Supreme Court of the United States has said. When the scope of Federal regulation of radio came before it, Chief Justice Hughes made it clear in reporting a unanimous decision that the Government's power over radio related to the allocation of facilities. Congress, moreover, does not recognize the right of the Federal Communications Commission to deal with the content of radio programs unless, of course, they run counter to the customary laws of libel or the dissemination of obscene or fraudulent matter.

#### ALWAYS DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

If now, however, a governmental commission may say what is or is not international good will, censorship in fact exists. For there are differences of opinion as to what constitutes good will. During the recent civil war in Spain, had the same rule been operative, one faction in America might have insisted that radio broadcasts from New York designed to reach the Spanish people were not good will, and another might have insisted that the broadcasts were a splendid moral support.

The power of the Federal Government to limit the freedom of speech or of the press has a background of established precedents, but it is quite possible that, if radio opens up now a new avenue of governmental regulation, the President's public comment of May 9 may come to mean that in all respects the press is just as free as radio.

For it is a short step for the Federal Government to contend that, because newspapers enjoy second-class mail rates, they can be regulated as to their content. The Supreme Court has always re-

jected such an interpretation, but suppose the Post Office Department, acting on a request from some other Government department, should say that all editorials or printed articles which do not tend to promote good will should be prohibited from publication in newspapers or magazines exported to foreign countries. Would that not be on all fours, so far as governmental power is concerned, with the latest action of the Federal Communications Commission?

The Commission has made it clear in its public announcement that radio stations which do not obey the order will possibly lose their licenses. So also an arbitrary government could say that all newspapers which do not conform to the Government's ideas of what constitutes good will in published articles shall lose second-class mail privileges.

#### NEWSPAPERS COULD BE CONTROLLED SIMILARLY

Whatever concerns the regulation of the contents of radio programs concerns equally the contents of newspapers. It can hardly be said that radio is a different art. For today broadcasting stations are used to transmit by radio the copies of what are known as facsimile newspapers. Likewise, television comes through radio broadcasting stations, and, if the Federal Communications Commission obtains the right to censor what is said in international programs by threatening to discontinue a license, it can do so with respect to television, too. This means that speakers can be kept from public appearances in any form of radio facilities if their ideas of good will do not correspond to those of the Government censors in Washington.

It would have been a simple matter for the Communications Commission to have transmitted as a matter of patriotism any request from the Department of State to radio stations broadcasting international programs. In the period of the World War the entire American press operated on that very kind of informal voluntary basis. The same end would have been obtained by asking and not ordering radio stations or threatening them with loss of licenses.

As it is, the case is one which doubtless will attract the attention of the American Civil Liberties Committee, which has done yeoman work in preventing reactionary influences from cutting down the opportunities of liberal expression identified with freedom of speech in America. An injunction suit against the Commission, asking the courts to restrain the Commission from applying any such order to a radio station, might be one way of getting the issue decided, for it is one of the most important things that have happened since radio began to be regulated. It is hardly an accidental move, because for the last 3 years various members of the Commission here have in public speeches indicated their belief that the Commission has a legal right to censor programs, or that Congress can order censorship just because wave lengths are licensed by the Federal Government. So also are second-class mail facilities a Government privilege, but it has never been abused with the consent of the courts.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of May 26, 1939]

#### RADIO CENSORSHIP

What broadcasters regard as a definite step toward radio censorship, the longest yet taken in that direction, was announced by the Federal Communications Commission in outlining a new ruling to govern international broadcasts from this country, restricting them to programs "which shall reflect the culture of this country and which will promote international good will, understanding, and cooperation."

The inference of that specification is that the broadcasters, in the opinion of the F. C. C., require a strict discipline and the threat of canceled licenses to keep them from engaging in ulterior activities; that only by strict control exercised by the authorities will international good will be preserved.

Heretofore the only restrictions formally bordering on censorship (also enforceable by cancellation of licenses) were those involving violation of laws against "public morals, obscenity, etc."

Yet it has been generally recognized, and for a long time, that radio censorship was a weapon vested in the licensing power exercised by the Federal Communications Commission. And short-wave broadcasts thus ostensibly commercialized for the first time will be exposed to the strongest censorship of all: except, of course—presumably, when government itself, or any of its agents, make a speech for foreign "cultural", or political, enlightenment.

The part that government has played in developing this situation and moving toward this censorship finds its most telling expression in the Chavez bill which would provide a \$3,000,000 Federal broadcasting station owned and operated by the Government to conduct its own international broadcasts.

The fallacy of that bill's contention that it would be primarily for such international listeners is obvious, considering that those same broadcasts would be heard by United States citizens as well.

It is recalled in this connection that earlier advocates of this same idea emphasized the project's value for its "national" benefits as well as international, and one witness before a House committee went so far as to stress the desirability of such a step "as a means of providing more adequate educational service to the people of this country through programs dealing especially with Government interests."

Feature the potentialities—political and otherwise—of such an arrangement, should governmental underlings have access to it as they would; should the "educational" program contemplated partake of the W. P. A. arts, theatrical, writers, and speech-making products; or should it run 24 hours or so per day to disseminate propaganda created in the various bureaus of government, whose activities are under such heavy fire.



Those who advocate such as that on the premise that South American listeners cannot today tune in on American programs, but are dependent exclusively on broadcasters from the Fascist lands, ignore positive proof that American broadcasting to them far exceeds already that from the other countries in question, and this without any subsidized broadcasting service here.

Well may America eye with suspicion and fear any such plan as this. Well may it eye with suspicion and fear, as well, every movement subjecting radio or the dissemination of news and information to censorship by government beyond such as is necessary to prevent salacious programs, the censorship, in other words, which already exists and certainly requires no elaboration.

If America would guard its treasured institutions—among them freedom—it must resist such encroachments as now threaten in the form of rigid censorship, with the same regard for freedom of broadcasting as has been successfully defended by the press with respect to its own freedom.

[From the New York Times of May 25, 1939]

#### RADIO CONTROL

More light needs to be thrown on the ruling of the Federal Communications Commission directing that international broadcast stations must "render only an international broadcast service which will reflect the culture of this country and which will promote international good will, understanding, and cooperation." Such a ruling could doubtless be interpreted so broadly as to mean little more than the general test, already applied to domestic stations, of whether their service is "in the public interest." But it could easily lend itself, also, to an interpretation that might bring about a real censorship.

This would involve definite dangers. If our international broadcast programs are to be censored so that they shall not offend this or that foreign government, it is only a step to the argument that it is at least as desirable to censor our domestic programs so that they shall not offend our own Government. It is not practical to consider the feelings of foreign rulers more tenderly than the feelings of our own. Censorship of all kinds has an inevitable tendency to spread.

A ruling such as the Federal Communications Commission has just announced, moreover, must tend to give our Government a responsibility for private utterances that it would not otherwise have. To announce that only those programs will be authorized which promote international good will, to imply that no program will be permitted that has the Government's disapproval, will be certain to give the impression abroad that any program which it does permit will have the Government's positive approval. If a speaker on such a broadcast, for example, though he has no official standing, attacks the policies of Japan in the Orient, the Japanese Government may want to learn from ours whether it considers this attack likely to "promote international good will." If it were the announced policy of our Government to allow the utmost practicable freedom of speech in international broadcasts, it would not assume responsibility for what was said. Nothing whatever should be done to encourage the impression that our private international broadcasting stations will be used as an instrument to reflect our Government's foreign policy.

This is not to deny that the question of the control of international as of domestic broadcasting involves some delicate problems. The Government does have a responsibility in relation to radio broadcasting that it does not have toward the older forms of publication. But the responsibilities it assumes should never be greater than the necessities of the case require. Certainly, those responsibilities should be general, not specific.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal of May 26, 1939]

#### FREEDOM OF THE AIR

In the light of the Federal Communications Commission's new order concerning international broadcasts, issued this week, the news that the National Council of Broadcasters is well along toward a voluntary code covering domestic programs is decidedly welcome. In this self-imposed code there is hope that any governmental attempt to limit freedom of the air will be successfully resisted.

The F. C. C.'s ruling certainly opens the door to such an attempt. If the Commission has the power to require that international broadcasts must "render an international broadcast service which will reflect the culture of this country and which will promote international good will, understanding, and cooperation," then it can go further in imposing restrictions on radio than it has yet gone. In that case the barriers against complete control may prove ineffective.

It is true that the F. C. C. has been inclined to interpret very broadly its right to insist that radio programs be "in the public interest." If the new ruling is similarly interpreted, there is nothing to worry about. But the urge to censor is always so strong that the situation will have to be watched lest it lead to attempts to gag the radio or limit unduly the freedom of the air.

There is a special reason for vigilance in this instance, because the Commission's order puts it in the position of exercising control over international broadcasts. To assume this power is to surrender the argument we usually make when foreign governments protest against utterances made here.

So far, however, the threat to programs meant for this country is small. It is that much less because the National Council of Broadcasters means to put radio's house in order on its own initiative and responsibility. The code now in the process of construction will not be perfect, and can be perfected only through experience, but it has the merit of starting a job that the Federal Government can undertake only at grave risk to a means of expression that, along with the press, must be kept free if democracy is to be preserved.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) News of May 26, 1939]

#### A CENSORSHIP FEAR

The licensees of international broadcasting stations in the United States are put under orders by the Federal Communications Commission to "render only a broadcast which will reflect the culture of this country and which will promote international good will, understanding and cooperation." The spirit of this order is commendable, but in some quarters it is held to carry disturbing implications.

"If this order is taken literally," says the New York Herald Tribune, "it can be construed as authorizing strict government supervision—which means censorship—over any local station whose programs may be heard outside the United States. This in itself is reason enough to question the soundness of the ruling."

The commission probably was taking into account the pernicious uses to which the radio is put in certain foreign countries. The German Government, for instance, uses it as an instrument of propaganda and attack. Regularly the German Government in broadcasts to the Far East and the Pacific, to Africa and the Middle East, to the United States and South America fulminates against the democracies.

One may believe, therefore, that the Communications Commission issued the order governing international broadcasting in all good faith. But the record in relation to the service of American stations does not suggest that it was necessary. In the circumstances, the Commission might do itself more justice by such an interpretative enlargement of the order as will dispel any fears of censorship.

[From the La Fayette (Ind.) Journal-Courier of May 26, 1939]

#### CENSORING RADIO

It is vitally important to free America that the blundering Federal Communications Commission shall act immediately to revoke its foolish and fascistic order regulating radio programs. Some time ago a foolish American Ambassador acted for another government in a silly attempt to censor a news reel in this country. In that case another government attempted to extend its own censorship methods to uncensored America. This move was deeply resented by all Americans who understand the tricks and subtuges of fascistic rulers.

Now the asinine Federal Communications Commission, which once before invaded the constitutional privacy of telegraphic messages to help a congressional committee out on a fishing expedition, has actually given out the dictum that radio stations broadcast only international programs of good will. The point is not good will but the right and power of any Government commission to issue orders as to the programs put on the air by radio stations.

Everybody knows that such an order from a New Deal bureau merely leads on to similar orders to other free agencies of communication. The bureaucracy which orders what shall be said and what shall not be said over the air is sure to continue overreaching itself and seeking control of the screen, the stage, and the press.

On May 9 the President stated the relation of government to radio. He limited the functions of government in radio to "such controls of operation as are necessary to prevent complete confusion on the air." He added, "In all other respects the radio is as free as the press." Of course, the attempted restriction and the order trying to tell radio stations what to say and what not to say, is directly in conflict with the President's declaration.

An executive who recognizes the vital importance of preventing fascistic attempts at censorship in America, ought to get busy immediately to see that the blundering Federal Communications Commission gets down off its high horse and withdraws its un-American order. He should see to it that the bureaucrats let the radio station up, and that the Commission ceases to bully radio.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Have any steps been taken to secure a hearing upon this matter?

Mr. WHEELER. There was no hearing at the time the rule was promulgated. I understand that it was adopted without the matter really being given very serious consideration by the Commission.

In fairness to the Commission, I think it should be said that they inadvertently adopted the rule without appreciating what they were doing. The Chairman of the Commission, Mr. McNinch, was not present. He was away, ill; but the rule was taken up and adopted. I understand that some

of the broadcasting companies, and perhaps the National Association of Broadcasters, have asked for a hearing. Certainly they should be given a hearing, and the matter should be thrashed out.

If the Commission has sought to impose censorship by radio, whether international radio or national radio, I think the Congress of the United States ought to pass a more stringent law against censorship of any kind or character in radio.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I rose simply to say that I am in hearty accord with the remarks of the Senator from Montana. I hope the hearing will be accorded the companies that may wish it; or, if they do not ask for a hearing, I hope the committee itself will take the matter in hand and determine just what should be done. We want no censorship of any sort in this country. If it is begun in one particular, it is only a step to another particular. So, as the subject is first broached, let us take care of it, and take care of it as it ought to be taken care of.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

I may say, for instance, that we have the question of neutrality before the Senate. Senators take different views with reference to neutrality. If the Senator from California and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] should take different views with reference to neutrality, as they probably would, it might be said that the Senator from Nevada would be permitted to make a speech over the radio, because there would be in it nothing which would be detrimental to any foreign country; and, on the other hand, the Commission might very easily say that what the Senator from California was going to say should not be sent out over the international radio.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Quite so; and the word "cultural" has a peculiar meaning according to the State Department. We might say something that was not in accord with the cultural views of somebody in the State Department, and then we would either be required to retract it or we would not be permitted to say it at all. So the subject is of sufficient importance that I am very, very glad the Senator from Montana has raised the question today. Let us continue our consideration of it until we find just what the situation is; and, if it be such as we suspect, let us remedy it.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations of postmasters (and withdrawing the nomination of a postmaster), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the following nominations:

Herbert E. Gaston, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, to fill an existing vacancy;

John L. Sullivan, of Manchester, N. H., to be assistant to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in place of Milton E. Carter, resigned;

Bernice Pyke, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio (reappointment); and

William P. Bowers, of Columbia, S. C., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of South Carolina, to fill an existing vacancy.

He also, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nominations of several passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Public Health Service.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the nominations of sundry doctors to be assistant surgeons in the Public Health Service.

Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Martin R. Bradley, of Hermansville, Mich., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich. (reappointment).

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers for appointment and promotion in the Navy.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers for promotion in the Marine Corps.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, reported favorably the nomination of Admiral William D. Leahy, of the District of Columbia, to be Governor of Puerto Rico, vice Hon. Blanton Winship, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

#### FEDERAL EMERGENCY ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC WORKS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry A. Wortham, of Kentucky, to be regional director of region No. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis H. Inge to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Henry Goguen to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral Chester W. Nimitz to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation with the rank of rear admiral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the term of office of Rear Admiral Nimitz as Chief of the Bureau of Navigation will begin on the 15th day of June this year. In order that he may take office at that time I ask that the President be notified at once of the action of the Senate in confirming the appointment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be immediately notified.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

#### IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 13, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.



## NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate June 12, 1939*

## POSTMASTERS

## ALABAMA

James D. McEachern to be postmaster at Brundidge, Ala., in place of J. D. McEachern. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1939.

Charles E. Niven to be postmaster at Columbiana, Ala., in place of C. E. Niven. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1939.

Bessie L. Butler to be postmaster at Double Springs, Ala., in place of B. L. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1939.

Willie W. Whittaker to be postmaster at Flomaton, Ala., in place of W. W. Whittaker. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1939.

Clarence C. Calhoun to be postmaster at Jackson, Ala., in place of C. C. Calhoun. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1939.

Nathaniel J. Davis to be postmaster at Marion, Ala., in place of N. J. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1939.

Charles R. Cain to be postmaster at Oakman, Ala., in place of C. R. Cain. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1939.

William W. Wilson to be postmaster at Oneonta, Ala., in place of W. W. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1939.

## ARIZONA

Jessie I. Cooper to be postmaster at Chandler, Ariz., in place of J. I. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

J. Albert Brown to be postmaster at St. Jons, Ariz., in place of J. A. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Neal H. Phelps to be postmaster at Springerville, Ariz., in place of N. H. Phelps. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

## ARKANSAS

Horace L. Lay to be postmaster at Amity, Ark., in place of H. L. Lay. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1939.

Robert W. Moore to be postmaster at Black Rock, Ark., in place of R. W. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1939.

Thomas S. Reynolds to be postmaster at Bradley, Ark., in place of T. S. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1939.

Dewey Carter to be postmaster at Elkins, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Olice F. Huson to be postmaster at Heber Springs, Ark., in place of O. F. Huson. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1939.

Frances E. Crouch to be postmaster at Lexa, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Leo D. Perdue to be postmaster at Louann, Ark., in place of L. D. Perdue. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1939.

Eva C. Teague to be postmaster at Manila, Ark., in place of E. C. Teague. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1939.

Rupert W. Barger to be postmaster at Mansfield, Ark., in place of R. W. Barger. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1939.

Romulus Owen Tomlinson to be postmaster at Melbourne, Ark., in place of R. O. Tomlinson. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1939.

Mark B. Craig to be postmaster at Russellville, Ark., in place of M. B. Craig. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1939.

Horatio J. Humphries to be postmaster at Salem, Ark., in place of H. J. Humphries. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1939.

Mildred B. Cooper to be postmaster at West Memphis, Ark., in place of M. B. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1938.

## CALIFORNIA

Mary Evalyn Rider to be postmaster at Balboa Island, Calif., in place of M. E. Rider. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Clayborne L. Boren to be postmaster at Bell, Calif., in place of C. L. Boren. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1939.

Helen S. Osborne to be postmaster at Earlimart, Calif., in place of H. S. Osborne. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Joel K. L. Schwartz to be postmaster at Fillmore, Calif., in place of J. K. L. Schwartz. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Solomon H. W. C. Geer to be postmaster at Live Oak, Calif., in place of S. H. W. C. Geer. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1939.

Hazel B. Stites to be postmaster at Maxwell, Calif., in place of H. B. Stites. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

George H. Kindred to be postmaster at Oxnard, Calif., in place of J. H. Canning, deceased.

Frederick Martin to be postmaster at Petaluma, Calif., in place of Frederick Martin. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

William H. McCloskey to be postmaster at Terra Bella, Calif., in place of M. O. Drake, resigned.

Harry D. Beck to be postmaster at Tipton, Calif., in place of H. D. Beck. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

## COLORADO

Earl E. Graham to be postmaster at Canon City, Colo., in place of E. E. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

Elmer B. McCrone to be postmaster at Creede, Colo., in place of E. B. McCrone. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1939.

Arthur D. Robb to be postmaster at Flagler, Colo., in place of A. D. Robb. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1939.

Mollie E. Arbuckle to be postmaster at Fruita, Colo., in place of J. B. Perkins, deceased.

Harold G. Hawkins to be postmaster at Grand Lake, Colo., in place of H. G. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1939.

Lucia A. Wheatley to be postmaster at Grand Valley, Colo., in place of L. A. Wheatley. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

Charles L. Dunn to be postmaster at Johnstown, Colo., in place of C. L. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1939.

Wilton T. Hutt to be postmaster at Norwood, Colo., in place of W. T. Hutt. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

## CONNECTICUT

John F. Connerty to be postmaster at Washington Depot, Conn., in place of J. F. Connerty. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

## FLORIDA

Elizabeth A. Cantrell to be postmaster at Kissimmee, Fla., in place of E. A. Cantrell. Incumbent's commission expired May 21, 1939.

William C. White to be postmaster at Live Oak, Fla., in place of W. C. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1939.

Robert E. Sweat to be postmaster at Mulberry, Fla., in place of R. E. Sweat. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1939.

Robert H. Roesch, Jr., to be postmaster at Oneco, Fla., in place of R. H. Roesch, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1939.

Elsie A. Harrison to be postmaster at Waverly, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

#### GEORGIA

James Rufus Youmans to be postmaster at Adrian, Ga., in place of G. E. Youmans, deceased.

Thornwell Jacobs to be postmaster at Oglethorpe University, Ga., in place of Thornwell Jacobs. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1939.

Duncan E. Flanders to be postmaster at Swainsboro, Ga., in place of D. E. Flanders. Incumbent's commission expired June 14, 1938.

Maynard Mashburn to be postmaster at Tate, Ga., in place of Sam Tate. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1939.

William O. Wolfe to be postmaster at Uvalda, Ga., in place of W. O. Wolfe. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1938.

Willie B. Persons to be postmaster at Warm Springs, Ga., in place of W. B. Persons. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1939.

#### IDAHO

William Schlick to be postmaster at Burley, Idaho, in place of William Schlick. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1938.

Jessie L. Kelly to be postmaster at Winchester, Idaho, in place of J. L. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

#### ILLINOIS

Ralph McLaughlin to be postmaster at Baylis, Ill., in place of Ralph McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1938.

George A. Wall to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, Ill., in place of G. A. Wall. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Charles H. Greenwood to be postmaster at Flora, Ill., in place of C. H. Greenwood. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1939.

George H. Henken to be postmaster at Germantown, Ill., in place of F. J. Bohnenkemper, resigned.

Fred C. Hall to be postmaster at Griggsville, Ill., in place of F. C. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1938.

George G. Vaughan to be postmaster at Hurst, Ill., in place of G. G. Vaughan. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

Frank J. Zipprich to be postmaster at Kampsville, Ill., in place of F. J. Zipprich. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1939.

Amiel J. Toelle to be postmaster at Orland Park, Ill., in place of A. J. Toelle. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Margaret Bradbury to be postmaster at Perry, Ill., in place of Margaret Bradbury. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1939.

Hallie Weir to be postmaster at Pleasant Hill, Ill., in place of Hallie Weir. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

John S. Browning to be postmaster at Royalton, Ill., in place of J. S. Browning. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

Burleigh A. Murray to be postmaster at Sesser, Ill., in place of B. A. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

#### INDIANA

James R. McDonald to be postmaster at Brookville, Ind., in place of J. R. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Helen B. Fultz to be postmaster at Crothersville, Ind., in place of H. B. Fultz. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1939.

Clyde F. Dreisbach to be postmaster at Fort Wayne, Ind., in place of E. J. Gallmeyer, resigned.

Charles D. Manaugh to be postmaster at Hanover, Ind., in place of C. D. Manaugh. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1939.

Edward L. Sacksteder to be postmaster at Leavenworth, Ind., in place of T. S. Stephenson, removed.

Orville R. Wells to be postmaster at Morgantown, Ind., in place of O. R. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Henry H. Powell to be postmaster at Newburgh, Ind., in place of H. H. Powell. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Benjamin F. Phipps to be postmaster at Pendleton, Ind., in place of B. F. Phipps. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Charles A. Boggs to be postmaster at Veedersburg, Ind., in place of I. C. Hardesty, resigned.

#### IOWA

Joseph W. Weber to be postmaster at Alta Vista, Iowa, in place of J. W. Weber. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Mary Doris Carroll to be postmaster at Clear Lake, Iowa, in place of M. D. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1938.

Earl P. Patten to be postmaster at Danbury, Iowa, in place of E. P. Patten. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Edward H. Schnebel to be postmaster at Farnhamville, Iowa, in place of E. H. Schnebel. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Gertrude Posten to be postmaster at Gravity, Iowa, in place of Gertrude Posten. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Frank J. A. Huber to be postmaster at Hawkeye, Iowa, in place of F. J. A. Huber. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1938.

James Lowell Carr to be postmaster at Lamont, Iowa, in place of J. L. Carr. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.

Richard A. Dunlevy to be postmaster at Lansing, Iowa, in place of R. A. Dunlevy. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

#### KANSAS

Laurence A. Daniels to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Kans., in place of L. A. Daniels. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1938.

Rachel E. Pierson to be postmaster at Isabel, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Joseph B. Riddle to be postmaster at Wichita, Kans., in place of J. B. Riddle. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1939.

#### KENTUCKY

Joe R. Richardson to be postmaster at Glasgow, Ky., in place of J. R. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired March 21, 1939.

Clarence L. Sharp to be postmaster at Liberty, Ky., in place of C. L. Sharp. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

William E. Crutcher to be postmaster at Morehead, Ky., in place of M. M. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1938.

Jones Ashby to be postmaster at Slaughters, Ky., in place of A. K. Slaton, removed.

#### LOUISIANA

Sidney L. Voorhies to be postmaster at Lafayette, La., in place of E. A. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Annie F. Gambrell to be postmaster at Minden, La., in place of E. G. Webb. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1934.

#### MARYLAND

Guy K. Motter to be postmaster at Frederick, Md., in place of G. K. Motter. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1939.

William H. Condiff to be postmaster at Solomons, Md., in place of W. H. Condiff. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.



## MASSACHUSETTS

Celia R. St. John to be postmaster at Cohasset, Mass., in place of C. R. St. John. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1939.

John D. Comins to be postmaster at Deerfield, Mass., in place of L. M. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1938.

Donald J. Newton to be postmaster at Montague, Mass., in place of S. L. Wildes, deceased.

## MICHIGAN

Lea M. Griffith to be postmaster at Flat Rock, Mich., in place of L. M. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1938.

Jennie O. Way to be postmaster at Rapid City, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1937.

Donald E. Howell to be postmaster at Wayne, Mich., in place of D. E. Howell. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1939.

## MINNESOTA

Virgia Poole to be postmaster at Effie, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Elmer L. Berg to be postmaster at Kennedy, Minn., in place of E. L. Berg. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1938.

## MISSISSIPPI

Mary A. Morris to be postmaster at Coahoma, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Jefferson D. Fogg to be postmaster at Hernando, Miss., in place of J. D. Fogg. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Charles P. Mallett to be postmaster at Laurel, Miss., in place of W. F. Skaggs, deceased.

William P. Young to be postmaster at Liberty, Miss., in place of A. T. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1938.

Lee D. Fulmer to be postmaster at Lumberton, Miss., in place of L. D. Fulmer. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1939.

## MISSOURI

Charles M. Murray to be postmaster at Cameron, Mo., in place of C. M. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1938.

Earl A. Seay to be postmaster at Salem, Mo., in place of E. A. Seay. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1939.

John F. Vermillion to be postmaster at Salisbury, Mo., in place of J. F. Vermillion. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

Edward J. Dempsey to be postmaster at Shelby, Mo., in place of E. J. Dempsey. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1939.

Brook Miller to be postmaster at Weston, Mo., in place of Brook Miller. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1939.

## MONTANA

Martin P. Browne to be postmaster at Lambert, Mont., in place of M. P. Browne. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1939.

## NEBRASKA

Alfred O. Sick to be postmaster at Blair, Nebr., in place of J. P. Jensen, deceased.

John A. Gibson to be postmaster at Mullen, Nebr., in place of J. A. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1938.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ray A. Hicks to be postmaster at Colebrook, N. H., in place of R. A. Hicks. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1939.

Edwin L. Batchelder to be postmaster at Hampton, N. H., in place of E. L. Batchelder. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Edna C. Mason to be postmaster at Tamworth, N. H., in place of E. C. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1938.

James R. Kill Kelley to be postmaster at Wilton, N. H., in place of J. R. Kill Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1939.

## NEW JERSEY

Edwin Case to be postmaster at Flemington, N. J., in place of Edwin Case. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1938.

Joseph Corse to be postmaster at Jamesburg, N. J., in place of Joseph Corse. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.

Joseph A. Boyle, Jr., to be postmaster at Longport, N. J., in place of Louis Quinby, resigned.

Luella Brown to be postmaster at Old Bridge, N. J., in place of Luella Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1939.

## NEW MEXICO

Lena B. Sexton to be postmaster at Las Cruces, N. Mex., in place of A. M. O'Hara, removed.

Lillian E. Howard to be postmaster at Portales, N. Mex., in place of L. E. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1939.

## NEW YORK

Fuller F. Cornwall to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, N. Y., in place of F. F. Cornwall. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

Harry A. Stolz to be postmaster at Bethpage, N. Y., in place of H. A. Stolz. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1939.

Margaret L. Lauchert to be postmaster at Blasdell, N. Y., in place of M. L. Lauchert. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1939.

Alphonzo E. Fitch to be postmaster at Cazenovia, N. Y., in place of A. E. Fitch. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1939.

Harry M. Fisher, Jr., to be postmaster at Nanuet, N. Y., in place of F. W. Colligan, deceased.

Alvah P. Saulpaugh to be postmaster at Red Hook, N. Y., in place of A. P. Saulpaugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1939.

Rose H. Breen to be postmaster at Roslyn, N. Y., in place of R. H. Breen. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

Howard W. Smith to be postmaster at Unadilla, N. Y., in place of H. W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

## NORTH CAROLINA

James W. Ogburn to be postmaster at Rural Hall, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

## OHIO

Floyd L. Carr to be postmaster at Bedford, Ohio, in place of F. L. Carr. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1939.

Paul Schmidt to be postmaster at East Palestine, Ohio, in place of P. C. Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1939.

Walter P. Guenther to be postmaster at Glenmont, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Lillian C. Goodell to be postmaster at Mantua, Ohio, in place of L. C. Goodell. Incumbent's commission expired May 2, 1938.

Albert J. Beckman to be postmaster at St. Henry, Ohio, in place of A. J. Beckman. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1939.

William E. Alexander to be postmaster at Spring Valley, Ohio, in place of W. E. Alexander. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1939.

William A. Barnhart to be postmaster at Sterling, Ohio, in place of W. A. Barnhart. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1939.

## OKLAHOMA

Rosa B. Britton to be postmaster at Cyril, Okla., in place of R. B. Britton. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1939.

## OREGON

Frank DeSouza to be postmaster at Medford, Oreg., in place of Frank DeSouza. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Alonzo I. Hodges to be postmaster at Merrill, Oreg., in place of I. C. Griffin, removed.

Frederick B. Hollister to be postmaster at North Bend, Oreg., in place of M. A. Hollister, deceased.

Ralph B. Bennett to be postmaster at The Dalles, Oreg., in place of H. E. Barr, deceased.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Rebecca A. Murphy to be postmaster at Cherry Tree, Pa., in place of R. A. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.

Marguerite E. Tryon to be postmaster at Croydon, Pa., in place of J. L. Hewitt. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

Joseph Polacky to be postmaster at Dallas, Pa., in place of G. T. Kirkendall, resigned.

Mary Liberatore to be postmaster at Denbo, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Allan Rye to be postmaster at Edinboro, Pa., in place of Allan Rye. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

William Galicic to be postmaster at Export, Pa., in place of J. F. Lauffer, removed.

Tony T. Turk to be postmaster at Falls Creek, Pa., in place of T. J. McCausland, deceased.

Ross F. Rick to be postmaster at Girard, Pa., in place of R. F. Rick. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

Robert J. Courtney to be postmaster at Gouldsboro, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Kathryne A. Bird to be postmaster at Guys Mills, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Albert C. Beard to be postmaster at High Spire, Pa., in place of A. C. Beard. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

Charles E. Puskar to be postmaster at Imperial, Pa., in place of C. E. Puskar. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

James A. Sproull to be postmaster at Leechburg, Pa., in place of J. A. Sproull. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1938.

Charles Furner Cairns to be postmaster at Ligonier, Pa., in place of C. M. Shoup, removed.

Joseph Harper Galbraith to be postmaster at McDonald, Pa., in place of J. H. Galbraith. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

George W. Burgner to be postmaster at Morrisville, Pa., in place of G. W. Burgner. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.

Mary M. Davis to be postmaster at Mount Morris, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Walter S. Mervine to be postmaster at Mount Pocono, Pa., in place of W. S. Mervine. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1939.

Chester A. Bower to be postmaster at New Oxford, Pa., in place of C. A. Bower. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1939.

Andrew S. Knepp to be postmaster at North East, Pa., in place of A. S. Knepp. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

Robert C. Moore to be postmaster at Oxford, Pa., in place of R. C. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

George A. Lehman to be postmaster at Patton, Pa., in place of G. A. Lehman. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Harold L. Heimbach to be postmaster at Quakertown, Pa., in place of H. L. Heimbach. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.

Jesse S. Stambaugh to be postmaster at Spring Grove, Pa., in place of J. S. Stambaugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

Ronald S. Kayzer to be postmaster at Tioga, Pa., in place of R. S. Kayzer. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.

Nicholas A. Staub to be postmaster at Trucksville, Pa., in place of W. C. Luksic, removed.

Charles V. Johnston to be postmaster at Woolrich, Pa., in place of C. V. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

Minnie E. M. Busser to be postmaster at York Haven, Pa., in place of M. E. M. Busser. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

## RHODE ISLAND

James V. O'Connell to be postmaster at Washington, R. I., in place of J. V. O'Connell. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1939.

Thomas J. Durand to be postmaster at West Warwick, R. I., in place of T. J. Durand. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Ralph G. Kennedy to be postmaster at Batesburg, S. C., in place of R. G. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

Charles P. DuBose to be postmaster at Camden, S. C., in place of C. P. DuBose. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

William H. P. Faddis to be postmaster at Clearwater, S. C., in place of W. H. P. Faddis. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

Harris P. DuBose to be postmaster at Jefferson, S. C., in place of H. P. DuBose. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

Junius Scott Bagnal to be postmaster at Manning, S. C., in place of J. S. Bagnal. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

J. Sidney McNeill to be postmaster at Ninety Six, S. C., in place of J. S. McNeill. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Jesse B. Taylor to be postmaster at St. Matthews, S. C., in place of J. B. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

Maebelle B. Orvin to be postmaster at St. Stephen, S. C., in place of Maebelle Orvin. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

James M. Nelson to be postmaster at Summerton, S. C., in place of J. M. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

Stacy Kearse to be postmaster at Walterboro, S. C., in place of Stacy Kearse. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

Nellie B. Birt to be postmaster at Williston, S. C., in place of N. B. Birt. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Lewis E. Smith to be postmaster at Alpena, S. Dak., in place of L. E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 12, 1939.

Fred C. Wetterberg to be postmaster at Arlington, S. Dak., in place of F. C. Wetterberg. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1939.

John D. Cannon to be postmaster at Fort Pierre, S. Dak., in place of J. D. Cannon. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1938.

Michael J. Matthews to be postmaster at Isabel, S. Dak., in place of M. J. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1938.

Mabel M. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Plankinton, S. Dak., in place of M. M. Fitzgerald. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1939.



## TENNESSEE

LaVerne Gearhiser to be postmaster at Big Sandy, Tenn., in place of LaVerne Gearhiser. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Henry S. Dupree to be postmaster at Brownsville, Tenn., in place of H. S. Dupree. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Timmie M. Bryant to be postmaster at Charleston, Tenn., in place of T. M. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

James W. Stout to be postmaster at Decaturville, Tenn., in place of J. W. Stout. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1938.

Walter W. Ryburn to be postmaster at Erwin, Tenn., in place of W. W. Ryburn. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1939.

Fred C. Lindsay to be postmaster at Greeneville, Tenn., in place of F. C. Lindsay. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1939.

Ethelbert J. Shannon to be postmaster at Halls, Tenn., in place of E. J. Shannon. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

William R. Massey to be postmaster at Harriman, Tenn., in place of W. R. Massey. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1939.

Shelbin C. Malone to be postmaster at Henderson, Tenn., in place of S. C. Malone. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1939.

James H. Smith to be postmaster at Martin, Tenn., in place of J. H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Bedford T. Transou to be postmaster at Mason, Tenn., in place of B. T. Transou. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Charles P. Fults to be postmaster at Monteagle, Tenn., in place of C. P. Fults. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Willia J. McCrary to be postmaster at Philadelphia, Tenn., in place of W. J. McCrary. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1939.

Carey E. Reed to be postmaster at Prospect Station, Tenn., in place of C. E. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1939.

William A. Rhea to be postmaster at Somerville, Tenn., in place of W. A. Rhea. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.

Jean N. McGuire to be postmaster at Sweetwater, Tenn., in place of J. N. McGuire. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1939.

## TEXAS

Benjamin A. Borskey to be postmaster at Alvin, Tex., in place of B. A. Borskey. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Sam Hagin to be postmaster at Anna, Tex., in place of Sam Hagin. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Alfred H. Clark to be postmaster at Bremond, Tex., in place of A. H. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1939.

Sarah E. Burns to be postmaster at Center, Tex., in place of S. E. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Ambrose J. Denman to be postmaster at Channing, Tex., in place of A. J. Denman. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

James A. Hilburn to be postmaster at Childress, Tex., in place of J. A. Hilburn. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1939.

Bertram D. Wren to be postmaster at Clarksville, Tex., in place of B. D. Wren. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Carl W. Appling to be postmaster at Claude, Tex., in place of C. W. Appling. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Fillmore R. Anderson to be postmaster at Cross Plains, Tex., in place of I. H. Kendrick. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1936.

Mary Y. Guylar to be postmaster at Crystal City, Tex., in place of S. S. Pegues, resigned.

Zettie Kelley to be postmaster at Diboll, Tex., in place of Zettie Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Mary B. Harper to be postmaster at Eagle Pass, Tex., in place of M. B. Harper. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Marshal E. Kelley to be postmaster at Earth, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Fronie R. Allen to be postmaster at Emory, Tex., in place of F. R. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Noel J. Reynolds to be postmaster at Ennis, Tex., in place of N. J. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Noma N. Lokey to be postmaster at Farwell, Tex., in place of N. N. Lokey. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Marcellus P. Adams to be postmaster at Lampasas, Tex., in place of M. P. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Helen L. Hall to be postmaster at League City, Tex., in place of H. L. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1939.

Johnnie R. Back to be postmaster at McLean, Tex., in place of L. A. Wilson, removed.

Alexander M. Bowie to be postmaster at San Benito, Tex., in place of A. M. Bowie. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Lily A. C. Tyree to be postmaster at Shafter, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Flake George to be postmaster at Shamrock, Tex., in place of Flake George. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Nena M. Iiams to be postmaster at Sugar Land, Tex., in place of N. M. Iiams. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1939.

Edgar H. McElroy to be postmaster at Waxahachie, Tex., in place of E. H. McElroy. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1939.

Balser B. Hefner to be postmaster at Weimar, Tex., in place of B. B. Hefner. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1939.

Faye Jessmyr Hood to be postmaster at Wortham, Tex., in place of T. H. Hood, deceased.

## UTAH

Wayne K. Sheffield to be postmaster at Kaysville, Utah, in place of K. H. Sheffield, resigned.

G. Leonard Larson to be postmaster at Sandy, Utah, in place of G. L. Larson. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

## VIRGINIA

Rosa L. Williams to be postmaster at Bassetts, Va., in place of R. L. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

Edgar E. Shannon to be postmaster at Bland, Va., in place of E. E. Shannon. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

William T. Paxton to be postmaster at Buena Vista, Va., in place of W. T. Paxton. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

John D. Webb to be postmaster at Disputanta, Va., in place of J. D. Webb. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Robert A. Smith to be postmaster at Gordonsville, Va., in place of R. A. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Mary Ann Nichols to be postmaster at Hamilton, Va., in place of M. A. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1939.

Annie R. Walker to be postmaster at Herndon, Va., in place of A. R. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Alvin D. Davis to be postmaster at Lorton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Bourbon N. Kibler to be postmaster at Luray, Va., in place of B. N. Kibler. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

Milton E. Gee to be postmaster at Meherrin, Va., in place of M. E. Gee. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Thomas M. Hesson to be postmaster at Monroe, Va., in place of T. M. Hesson. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Hollis H. Howard to be postmaster at Radford, Va., in place of H. H. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Samuel B. Harper to be postmaster at Stuarts Draft, Va., in place of S. B. Harper. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Thomas E. Frank to be postmaster at Warrenton, Va., in place of T. E. Frank. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

Gipsie B. Cassell to be postmaster at Wytheville, Va., in place of G. B. Cassell. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

#### WASHINGTON

Andrew F. Farris to be postmaster at Cashmere, Wash., in place of A. F. Farris. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Alfred K. Filson to be postmaster at Centralia, Wash., in place of A. K. Filson. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Hubert S. Storms to be postmaster at Chewelah, Wash., in place of H. S. Storms. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Harold W. Kreidel to be postmaster at Cle Elum, Wash., in place of H. W. Kreidel. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Fred E. Olmstead to be postmaster at Grandview, Wash., in place of F. E. Olmstead. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Frank H. Lincoln to be postmaster at Kennewick, Wash., in place of F. H. Lincoln. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Moses S. Brinkerhoff to be postmaster at Okanogan, Wash., in place of M. S. Brinkerhoff. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

Edwin Morris Starrett to be postmaster at Port Townsend, Wash., in place of E. M. Starrett. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.

#### WEST VIRGINIA

Thomas W. Zink, Jr., to be postmaster at Keystone, W. Va., in place of T. W. Zink, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

William S. Wray to be postmaster at Northfork, W. Va., in place of W. S. Wray. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

Ursula A. Dougherty to be postmaster at Ridgeley, W. Va., in place of U. A. Dougherty. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1939.

#### WISCONSIN

Bert J. Walker to be postmaster at Almond, Wis., in place of B. J. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1938.

Andrew J. Osborne to be postmaster at Barron, Wis., in place of A. J. Osborne. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1938.

Marguerite Irene Knapmiller to be postmaster at Birchwood, Wis., in place of Irene Knapmiller. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1938.

Fred Martin to be postmaster at Brantwood, Wis., in place of Berthea Overgard, resigned.

Willis Engebretsen to be postmaster at Eagle, Wis., in place of Willis Engebretsen. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Laurence L. Shove to be postmaster at Onalaska, Wis., in place of L. L. Shove. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1938.

Edmund O. Johnson to be postmaster at Warrens, Wis., in place of E. O. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Marnell E. McCloskey to be postmaster at Wauseka, Wis., in place of R. W. Lathrop. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1938.

#### WYOMING

Albert H. Linford to be postmaster at Afton, Wyo., in place of A. H. Linford. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1939.

Thomas P. Hill, Jr., to be postmaster at Buffalo, Wyo., in place of T. P. Hill, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1939.

John G. Kelly to be postmaster at Hanna, Wyo., in place of J. G. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1939.

Robert B. Landfair to be postmaster at Jackson, Wyo., in place of R. B. Landfair. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1939.

Percy D. Sims to be postmaster at Lovell, Wyo., in place of P. D. Sims. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1939.

James E. Smith to be postmaster at Riverton, Wyo., in place of J. E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1939.

James C. Jackson to be postmaster at Sheridan, Wyo., in place of J. C. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1938.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 12, 1939*

##### FEDERAL EMERGENCY ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC WORKS

Harry A. Wortham to be regional director, region 3, Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Francis H. Inge to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Joseph Henry Goguen to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

##### APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Chester W. Nimitz to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation with the rank of rear admiral.

##### APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY

Col. Thomas Matthews Robins to be Assistant to the Chief of Engineers with the rank of brigadier general.

##### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

##### TO JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Wilbur Kincaid Noel.

##### TO CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

Capt. Louis Edward Roemer.

Capt. Edgar Daniel Stark.

First Lt. Robert Walter Breaks.

First Lt. Bruce von Gerichten Scott.

Second Lt. Laverne Arthur Parks.

##### POSTMASTERS

##### ARKANSAS

Ruel L. Sain, Holly Grove.

Alonzo E. Nelson, Judsonia.

Richard S. Remy, Mulberry.

Lillian V. Spikes, Rogers.

Lewis B. Mason, Swifton.

Albert Judson Pryor, Texarkana.



## COLORADO

Darius Allen, Colorado Springs.  
Olive R. Ross, Deertrail.  
Louise H. Lawson, Grover.  
Floyd F. Hensler, Ordway.  
Carl E. Raney, Walsh.  
Carl H. Davis, Wiley.

## CONNECTICUT

George T. Manion, Avon.  
Harry L. Lyman, New Preston.  
William M. Logan, West Cheshire.

## IDAHO

William O. Putnam, Jr., Arco.  
Charles E. Bales, Caldwell.  
Louella R. Hollenbeck, Fruitland.  
Horten H. Tate, Glenns Ferry.  
Arthur T. Combs, Kellogg.  
Joseph D. Sullivan, Mountain Home.  
Charles O. McKay, Richfield.  
Thomas R. Miller, Ririe.  
George P. Smith, Wendell.

## INDIANA

Ralph D. Barry, Grandall.  
John A. Donohue, Elwood.  
Curtis Bennett, English.  
Dorothy V. Prall, Henryville.  
Adolph Seidensticker, Indianapolis.  
Thomas W. Hall, Medora.  
Joseph E. Herbst, Milan.

## MARYLAND

James J. Ohler, Glenarm.  
A. Emmons Warnick, Grantsville.  
Sarah Ann G. Phillips, Randallstown.

## NEBRASKA

Herman G. Mattson, Kearney.

## NEW MEXICO

Herman E. Kelt, Carrizozo.  
Thomas M. Rivera, Hanover.  
Theodore Raff, Los Lunas.

## OKLAHOMA

Wade H. LaBoon, Chickasha.  
Bruce G. Carter, Wewoka.

## OREGON

Victor Eckley, La Grande.  
Anna G. Wolford, Sprague River.

## RHODE ISLAND

Frank L. Giard, Pawtucket.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Ralph E. McCaskill, Bethune.  
John H. Crawford, Chester.  
Eric C. Goza, Columbia.  
Delle J. Laffitte, Cope.  
Thurman W. Boyd, Loris.  
Sue Scott, Pelzer.  
Jack D. Boyd, Ridgeway.  
Helen DuPre Moseley, Spartanburg.

## TEXAS

Ogden Johnson, Beaumont.  
Philip P. Wise, Bonham.  
Anna V. Smith, College Station.  
Raymond Ross, Del Rio.  
Sue B. Mullins, Grapevine.  
James G. Ponder, Happy.  
Burris C. Jackson, Hillsboro.  
Carl E. Range, Irving.  
George F. Sheppard, Italy.  
Alice W. Dotson, Jewett.  
John T. Holmes, Joaquin.  
William P. Dowling, Kirbyville.  
Charlotte M. Boyle, La Porte.

Carl A. Shipp, Liberty Hill.  
William H. Bruns, Louise.  
Amos H. Howard, Lubbock.  
Ben C. McElroy, Marshall.  
Fay F. Spragins, Martindale.  
Lou A. Wright, Milford.  
Louis O. Muenzler, New Ulm.  
Mardie J. Bennett, Normangee.  
William T. Henderson, Odessa.  
Lloyd O. Waldron, Panhandle.  
Thomas W. Russell, Paris.  
Rufus L. Hybarger, Pineland.  
William G. Carlisle, Plano.  
Ray S. Wait, Port Isabel.  
Lino Perez, Rio Grande City.  
Grady Norris, Roscoe.  
Ida Bowers, Tenaha.  
Samuel M. Gupton, West Columbia.  
Della Duncan, Wylie.

## VERMONT

Mary E. Malone, Manchester.

## VIRGINIA

Bessie M. Guy, Catlett.  
D. Irvine Persinger, Eagle Rock.  
Edgar McCarty Wiley, Fairfax.  
Edward M. Blake, Kilmarnock.  
John H. Cave, Lynchburg.  
Robert W. Shultice, Norfolk.  
George Leonard Elmore, Petersburg.

## WASHINGTON

Walter V. Cowderoy, Blaine.  
Harry E. Robbins, Coulee Dam.  
Morgan J. McNair, Farmington.  
John Lotto, Renton.  
Elizabeth DeLong, Silverdale.  
Fanny I. Jennings, Spangle.  
Rufus B. Kager, Sultan.  
Cecilia Allen, Zillah.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Arthur G. Martin, Fairmont.

## WITHDRAWAL

*Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 12, 1939*

## POSTMASTER

## WEST VIRGINIA

Anna M. Stephenson to be postmaster at Parkersburg, in the State of West Virginia.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the great Shepherd of the fold, who hast called across the centuries to worn-footed humanity, hear our prayer; feed us with the fruit of the tree of life that blooms in the garden of God. We pray Thee to make us useful that we may bring to Thee some token of work and service. We beseech Thee to spare and keep us from all harm and danger. Oh, touch our unanswered prayers and our unrealized dreams that we may feel the burden of a great purpose. As there are no faithful failures, may our souls breathe the spirit of helpfulness. Do Thou, blessed Lord, inspire us to be strong, upright men, rich in heart, sweet in the graces, and ever eager to seize the opportunity to serve the country which we love to call our home. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 10, 1939, was read and approved.